

By Mr. LORIMER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles O. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of citizens of Hurfville, N. J., favoring a national highways commission (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of Abraham Lincoln School, of Indianapolis, Ind., for the enactment of H. R. 17295, to aid the Lincoln Farm Association of New York to build and endow a national memorial to Abraham Lincoln on the site of the Lincoln birthplace farm in Kentucky—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, and Ladies' Auxiliary, of Derby; Robert Emmet Club, of New Britain; Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Wallingford, and John Mitchell Literary and Debating Society, of Wallingford, all in the State of Connecticut, against the treaty of arbitration now being negotiated between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Unity Grange, No. 117, of Deep River, Conn., for a national highways commission and Federal aid in construction of highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Interstate Local Assemblies of Ansonia, Derby, and Shelton, Conn., for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains (H. R. 20)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Woman's Club of Wallingford, Conn., against passage of Crumpacker bill, for appointment of employees to take the Thirteenth Census—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of Hartford Council, No. 210, United Commercial Traders of America, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of citizens of Girard, Ohio, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia (H. R. 4897)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Patrick Gillen and William B. Gere—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Sunbury (Pa.) Lodge, No. 43, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, favoring the Clapp free-pass amendment to S. 4260—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pineville (Pa.) Grange, No. 50, Patrons of Husbandry, for a national highways commission and for Federal aid in construction of public highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of James O. Fleming and 20 other citizens of Pennsylvania, for S. 3152, for additional protection to dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 3, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

### THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the Journal.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the Journal be approved.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire to correct the Journal, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's colleague is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I rise to a privileged motion.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the Journal stand approved. If the gentleman will yield to a suggestion—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to correct the Journal in good faith.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will suggest it to me I will include that in my motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. On page 4461 of the Record—

The SPEAKER. But this is the Journal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to state the facts so that I can be understood. It is announced that I am paired with Mr. LANDIS of Indiana. I had no knowledge of that, and subsequently—

The SPEAKER. Pairs do not go into the Journal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to have the Journal amended so as to show—

The SPEAKER. Pairs do not go into the Journal. They dwell only in the Record.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the record of the votes is in the Journal. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to have that corrected. I sug-

gest that on all the subsequent votes where I am recorded as not voting one way or the other that I shall be recorded as answering "present."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I modify my motion in that respect, to approve the Journal with the correction my colleague has indicated; that the gentleman from New York shall be marked as "present" instead of voting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion will be modified in that respect. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, as modified, that the Journal stand approved.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 130, noes 74.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 267, nays 3, answered "present" 8, not voting 110, as follows:

### YEAS—267.

Adair	Douglas	Humphreys, Miss. Parker, S. Dak.
Adamson	Draper	James, Addison D. Parsons
Aiken	Driscoll	James, Ollie M. Patterson
Alexander, Mo.	Durey	Jenkins
Alexander, N. Y.	Dwight	Johnson, Ky.
Allon	Ellerbe	Johnson, S. C.
Ames	Ellis, Oreg.	Jones, Va.
Anthony	Englebright	Jones, Wash.
Ashbrook	Esch	Kahn
Bannon	Favrot	Kellher
Barclay	Ferris	Kennedy, Iowa
Bartoldt	Fitzgerald	Kimball
Bartlett, Ga.	Floyd	Kitchin, Claude
Bartlett, Nev.	Focht	Knopf
Bates	Foss	Knowland
Beale, Pa.	Foster, Ill.	Kuftermann
Beall, Tex.	Foulkrod	Lafean
Bede	Fowler	Lamar, Mo.
Birdsall	Fuller	Lamb
Bonyng	Fulton	Langley
Booher	Gaines, Tenn.	Laning
Bowers	Gardner, Mich.	Lawrence
Boyd	Garner	Leake
Broadhead	Garrett	Lee
Brownlow	Gillespie	Legare
Brundidge	Gillett	Lever
Burgess	Glass	Lewis
Burke	Goebel	Lindbergh
Burleigh	Goldfogle	Littlefield
Burleson	Gordon	Lloyd
Burnett	Granger	Longworth
Burton, Ohio	Greene	Loud
Butler	Gregg	Lovering
Byrd	Hackett	Lowden
Calder	Hackney	McCall
Calderhead	Hall	McCreary
Caldwell	Hamill	McGavin
Campbell	Hamilton, Iowa	McGuire
Candler	Hamilton, Mich.	McHenry
Capron	Hamlin	McKinlay, Cal.
Carter	Hammond	McKinley, Ill.
Cary	Hardwick	McKinney
Caulfield	Hardy	McLachlan, Cal.
Chapman	Harrison	McLain
Clark, Fla.	Haskins	McLaughlin, Mich.
Clark, Mo.	Haugen	Macon
Clayton	Hawley	Malby
Cockran	Hay	Mann
Conner	Healin	Marshall
Cook, Colo.	Helm	Maynard
Cook, Pa.	Henry, Conn.	Mondell
Cooper, Tex.	Henry, Tex.	Moon, Pa.
Cooper, Wis.	Higgins	Moon, Tenn.
Cousins	Hill, Conn.	Moore, Tex.
Cox, Ind.	Hill, Miss.	Morse
Craig	Hitchcock	Mouser
Cravens	Holliday	Mudd
Crawford	Houston	Murdock
Crumpacker	Howell, N. J.	Murphy
Cushman	Howell, Utah	Needham
Dalzell	Hubbard, Iowa	Nelson
Davidson	Hubbard, W. Va.	Nicholls
Dawson	Huff	Norris
De Armond	Hughes, N. J.	Nye
Denby	Hull, Iowa	O'Connell
Denver	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett
Diekema	Humphrey, Wash.	Page

### NAYS—3.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Dixon

Gaines, W. Va.

Griggs

Howland

Shackelford

NOT VOTING—110.

Burton, Del.

Carlin

Chaney

Cocks, N. Y.

Cole

Cooper, Pa.

Coudrey

Darragh

Davenport

Davey, La.

Davis, Minn.

Dawes

Dunwell

Edwards, Ga.

Edwards, Ky.

Ellis, Mo.

Fairchild

Fassett

Finley

Flood

Foreney

Fornes

Foster, Ind.

Foster, Vt.

French

Gardner, Mass.

Gardner, N. J.

Gilham

Godwin

Graff

Graham

Gronna

Haggott

Hale

Harding

Hayes

Hepburn

Hinshaw

Howard

Hughes, W. Va.	Livingston	Porter	Sterling
Jackson	Lorimer	Powers	Stevens, Minn.
Keller	Loudenslager	Pratt	Townsend
Kennedy, Ohio	McDermott	Pujo	Vreeland
Kinkaid	McMillan	Rainey	Waldo
Kipp	McMorran	Rhinock	Wallace
Kitchin, Wm. W.	Madden	Riordan	Walton
Knapp	Madison	Ryan	Weems
Lamar, Fla.	Miller	Sabath	Weisse
Landis	Moore, Pa.	Saunders	Wheeler
Lassiter	Olcott	Sherman	Willett
Law	Olmsted	Small	Wilson, Pa.
Lenahan	Overstreet	Smith, Cal.	Wolf
Lilley	Parker, N. J.	Smith, Mo.	
Lindsay	Pearre	Steenerson	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
For this session:

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.  
Mr. KNOPF with Mr. WEISSE.  
Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RIORDAN.  
Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. FURNES.  
Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.  
Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Until April 14:

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. KIPP.

Until April 4:

Mr. HOWLAND with Mr. ANSBERRY.

Until further notice:

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia.  
Mr. FOSTER of Indiana with Mr. BRANTLEY.  
Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. DIXON.  
Mr. FRENCH with Mr. DAVENPORT.  
Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BELL of Georgia.  
Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. CARLIN.  
Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.  
Mr. KNAPP with Mr. LINDSAY.  
Mr. MILLER with Mr. PUJO.  
Mr. OLCOTT with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

For this day:

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. SABATH.  
Mr. WATSON with Mr. WOLF.  
Mr. ADDISON D. JAMES with Mr. KIMBALL.  
Mr. POWERS with Mr. PRATT.  
Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. WALLACE.  
Mr. BRICK with Mr. WM. W. KITCHIN.  
Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. GODWIN.  
Mr. FASSETT with Mr. LAMAR of Florida.  
Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. McDERMOTT.  
Mr. GRONNA with Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
Mr. McMILLAN with Mr. WILLETT.  
Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. FLOOD.  
Mr. GILHAMS with Mr. HOWARD.  
Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. LENAHA.  
Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. BROUSSARD.  
Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. RHINOCK.  
Mr. WHEELER with Mr. RYAN.  
Mr. HARDING with Mr. SMALL.  
Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. MADDEN with Mr. SAUNDERS.

On this vote:

Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. LASSITER.  
Mr. PEARRE with Mr. RAINEY.  
Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.  
Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?  
The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.  
Mr. HELM. I was present in the House and listening when my name should have been called.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.  
The name of Mr. HELM was called, and he voted aye, as above recorded.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I find that I am paired.  
I voted in the negative and I desire to be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.  
The Clerk called the name of Mr. SHACKLEFORD, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

Mr. STEENERSOON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how I am recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I submit a privileged report upon the bill H. R. 19955, an act making appropriation to supply certain additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, with Senate amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union be discharged from the consideration of the Senate amendments and that they be considered in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from consideration of the amendments to the bill indicated and consider the Senate amendments in the House.

Mr. TAWNEY. And pending that request, Mr. Speaker, I want to state to the House that this is the urgent deficiency bill carrying a deficiency appropriation of \$2,000,000 for armor and armament, and that unless the bill can be passed speedily the employment of the men in the Gun Factory at Washington Navy-Yard will necessarily be interfered with and the services of many of them will have to be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object I wish to state that I think this matter—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object? Neither gentlemen are in the status of recognition for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not yield the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota does not have the floor except for one purpose, and that is to ask unanimous consent, and all other things that follow touch unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I permitted the gentleman from Minnesota to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi can ask the House for unanimous consent to make a statement if he desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite usual on the floor to reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DALZELL. The regular order!

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Senate amendments to the urgent deficiency bill reported to the House.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS), there were 140 ayes and 80 noes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 268, nays 1, answered "present" 9, not voting 110, as follows:

#### YEAS—268.

Adair	Cooper, Wis.	Haggott	Lamar, Mo.
Adamson	Cousins	Hall	Langley
Aiken	Cox, Ind.	Hamill	Lanning
Alexander, Mo.	Craig	Hamilton, Iowa	Law
Alexander, N. Y.	Cravens	Hamilton, Mich.	Lawrence
Allen	Crawford	Hamlin	Leake
Ames	Cushman	Hardwick	Lee
Anthony	Dalzell	Hardy	Legare
Ashbrook	Darragh	Haskins	Lever
Bannon	Davidson	Haugen	Lewis
Barclay	Davis, Minn.	Hawley	Lindbergh
Bartholdt	Dawson	Hay	Littlefield
Bartlett, Ga.	De Armond	Heflin	Lloyd
Bartlett, Nev.	Denby	Helm	Longworth
Bates	Denver	Henry, Conn.	Loud
Beale, Pa.	Douglas	Henry, Tex.	Lovering
Beall, Tex.	Draper	Higgins	Lowden
Bede	Driscoll	Hill, Miss.	McCall
Bell, Ga.	Durey	Hitchcock	McCreary
Birdsall	Dwight	Hobson	McGavin
Bonyne	Ellerbe	Holliday	McHenry
Booher	Ellis, Mo.	Houston	McKinlay, Cal.
Bowers	Englebright	Howell, N. J.	McKinley, Ill.
Boyd	Esch	Howell, Utah	McKinney
Brodhead	Favrot	Hubbard, Iowa	McLachlan, Cal.
Brownlow	Ferris	Hubbard, W. Va.	McLain
Brundidge	Fitzgerald	Huff	McLaughlin, Mich.
Burgess	Floyd	Hughes, N. J.	Macon
Burke	Focht	Hull, Iowa	Malby
Burleigh	Foss	Hull, Tenn.	Mann
Burleson	Foster, Ill.	Humphrey, Wash.	Marshall
Burnett	Foulkrod	Humphreys, Miss.	Maynard
Burton, Ohio	Fuller	Jackson	Miller
Butler	Fulton	James, Addison D.	Mondell
Byrd	Gaines, Tenn.	James, Ollie M.	Moon, Pa.
Campbell	Gaines, W. Va.	Johnson, Ky.	Moon, Tenn.
Candler	Gardner, Mich.	Johnson, S. C.	Moore, Tex.
Capron	Garner	Jones, Va.	Mouser
Carlin	Garrett	Jones, Wash.	Mudd
Carter	Gill	Kahn	Murdock
Cary	Gillespie	Keliber	Murphy
Caulfield	Gillett	Kennedy, Iowa	Needham
Chapman	Glass	Kennedy, Ohio	Nelson
Clark, Mo.	Goebel	Kimball	Nicholls
Clayton	Gordon	Kinkaid	Norris
Cockran	Granger	Kitchin, Claude	Nye
Conner	Greene	Knopf	O'Connell
Cook, Colo.	Gregg	Knowland	Padgett
Cook, Pa.	Hackett	Kuermann	Page
Cooper, Tex.	Hackney	Lafean	Parker, N. J.

Parker, S. Dak.	Richardson	Smith, Iowa	Thomas, N. C.
Parsons	Roberts	Smith, Mich.	Thomas, Ohio
Patterson	Robinson	Smith, Tex.	Tirrell
Payne	Rodenberg	Snapp	Tou Velle
Perkins	Rothermel	Southwick	Underwood
Peters	Rucker	Sparkman	Volstead
Pollard	Russell, Mo.	Sperry	Waldo
Pou	Russell, Tex.	Stafford	Wanger
Pray	Scott	Stanley	Washburn
Prince	Shackleford	Steenerson	Watkins
Rainey	Sheppard	Stephens, Tex.	Webb
Randell, Tex.	Sherley	Sturgiss	Wiley
Ransdell, La.	Sherwood	Sulloway	Williams
Rauch	Sims	Sulzer	Wilson, Ill.
Reeder	Slayden	Tawney	Wood
Reid	Slomp	Taylor, Ohio	Woodyard
Reynolds	Smith, Cal.	Thistlewood	Young

## NAYS—1.

Harrison

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Bennet, N. Y.	Dixon	Goulden	Hammond
Calderhead	Goldfogle	Griggs	Howland
Currier			

## NOT VOTING—110.

Acheson	Edwards, Ky.	Keifer	Pratt
Andrus	Ellis, Oreg.	Kipp	Pujo
Ansberry	Fairchild	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rhinock
Barchfeld	Fassett	Knapp	Riordan
Bennett, Ky.	Finley	Lamar, Fla.	Ryan
Bingham	Flood	Lamb	Sabath
Boutell	Fordney	Landis	Saunders
Bradley	Fornes	Lassiter	Sherman
Brantley	Foster, Ind.	Lenahan	Small
Brick	Foster, Vt.	Lilley	Smith, Mo.
Broussard	Fowler	Lindsay	Spight
Brumm	French	Livingston	Sterling
Burton, Del.	Gardner, Mass.	Lorimer	Stevens, Minn.
Calder	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Talbott
Caldwell	Gilham	McDermott	Taylor, Ala.
Chaney	Godwin	McGuire	Townsend
Clark, Fla.	Graff	McMillan	Vreeland
Cocks, N. Y.	Graham	McMorran	Wallace
Cole	Gronna	Madden	Watson
Cooper, Pa.	Hale	Madison	Weeks
Coudrey	Harding	Moore, Pa.	Weems
Crumpacker	Hayes	Morse	Weisse
Davenport	Hepburn	Olcott	Wheeler
Davey, La.	Hill, Conn.	Olmsted	Willett
Dawes	Hinslaw	Overstreet	Wilson, Pa.
Diekema	Howard	Pearre	Wolf
Dunwell	Hughes, W. Va.	Porter	
Edwards, Ga.	Jenkins	Powers	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. HALE with Mr. HAMMOND.

Mr. MADISON with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. LAMB.

For the balance of the day:

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. CHANEY with Mr. TALBOTT.

Until further notice:

Mr. KEIFER with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. LILLEY with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how I am recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. MCGUIRE. I would like to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening when his name was called?

Mr. MCGUIRE. I was in the House trying to give attention, but some one was talking with me and my name slipped by without my noticing it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman hardly brings himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19955, the urgent deficiency bill, with Senate amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the first amendment of the Senate is the deficiency of \$50,000 for the transportation of contract surgeons and officers of the Army. The amendment was made in the Senate because of the fact that the appropriation for the transportation of officers and contract surgeons of the Army is practically exhausted, or will be in the course of a week or ten days. The other deficiencies are small items—one for the purpose of supplying the police department with fuel and other items of subsistence, and the other is in relation to one of the wards in the Garfield Hospital, in the District of

Columbia. I shall, when these amendments are read under the five-minute rule in Committee of the Whole, move to concur in all of them, and am directed by the Committee on Appropriations so to do.

I now move that the committee rise for the purpose of closing debate on this amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question? I do not know that there is to be any difficulty about closing general debate. I should like, however, to ask two questions before the gentleman does that, if he will yield.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The amendment respecting mileage in the Army provides for a deficiency of \$50,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does that arise from these extraordinary horseback tests that the President has been holding during the present year?

Mr. TAWNEY. Ten thousand dollars is in consequence of what the gentleman from New York calls the extraordinary horseback tests.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would be delighted to characterize them in any other way, if the gentleman can suggest some expression.

Mr. TAWNEY. Oh, I do not need to suggest anything to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. When the deficiency bill was before the House the gentleman from Minnesota, acting upon the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy, stated that the \$2,000,000 for armor and armament must be appropriated in order to prevent the dismissal of men from the Gun Factory at the navy-yard here. Since the bill passed the House, a large number of those men, 250 I am informed, have been furloughed for ninety days. Now, is there any prospect that if the appropriation is made these men will be restored to work before the expiration of the furlough?

Mr. TAWNEY. In answer to the gentleman from New York I will read from page 9 of the hearings a statement made by Secretary Metcalf:

Mr. METCALF. Understand me: We have on hand at the present time sufficient money to meet every obligation of the Department. There is no deficiency at the present time. Now, we can take this money; with it we can pay for armor when it is delivered, but we have practically to stop work at the Washington Gun Factory and at some of the navy-yards of the country. We purchase the rough forgings, the gun mounts, and things of that kind, and then the finished product is turned out by the Washington Navy-Yard. We can pursue one of two courses. We can take the money on hand at the present time and meet the obligations, but in that case we would have to stop work at the navy-yards and discharge the men. Or we can continue the work at the navy-yard in the manufacture of armament, and so on, and help up the bills. It is for Congress to decide which of these two courses we shall pursue.

In accordance with that statement the Committee on Appropriations within two days after the estimate was submitted to the committee, through the Speaker of the House, reported out this urgent deficiency bill, carrying \$2,000,000, the amount of the deficiency estimated for the purpose of continuing if possible the employment of the men in the Gun Factory in Washington Navy-Yard. The bill was passed promptly by the House. It went to the Senate. It was returned here with three or four amendments, the principal one of which is the mileage amendment for the Army. Consent was asked, by myself, of the House to consider these amendments in the House instead of in the Committee of the Whole, and that was denied by the minority leader of the House. The bill then went to the Committee on Appropriations and has now been reported with the Senate amendments and is now awaiting favorable action by the House itself. When that action is taken, Congress will have provided for the payment of the armor and the employment of the men in the Gun Factory, if the Navy Department desires to continue their employment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman from Minnesota able to explain the action of the Department? The House within two days reported a bill. It was passed promptly and went to the Senate, and within three or four days the bill went through both Houses. Within a day or two it will become a law. Yet, although the Secretary states that this appropriation will enable the Department, and was intended by the Department, to keep employed the men at this navy-yard in Washington, he has furloughed a large number of men for ninety days. I suggest that that is not keeping faith either with the gentleman from Minnesota or with the House.

Mr. TAWNEY. I can only explain or answer the gentleman by saying that the Secretary of the Navy, having once served in the House of Representatives and being familiar with the delays incident to the tactics that are now being employed by the minority and have been for several days, came to the conclusion that rather than risk continuing the employment of

men without money to pay for their services he would adopt the other policy of furloughing them. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. I insist upon my motion that the committee do now rise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely want to ask the gentleman a question—

Mr. TAWNEY. I have not yielded.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 112, noes 61.

So the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19955, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, and that all debate on the bill and Senate amendments be closed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill with Senate amendments, and, pending that motion, moves that all debate be now closed.

Mr. TAWNEY. And on that I move the previous question.

Mr. SPEAKER. And on that the gentleman from Minnesota moves the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 136, noes 80.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi demands tellers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to save the time of the House, I will ask for the yeas and nays. [Laughter.]

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 148, nays 94, answered "present" 12, not voting 134, as follows:

## YEAS—148.

Adair	Dawson	Hull, Iowa	Murdock
Alexander, Mo.	Denby	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham
Alexander, N. Y.	Dickema	James, Addison D.	Nelson
Allen	Douglas	Jones, Wash.	Norris
Ames	Draper	Kahn	Nye
Anthony	Durey	Keifer	Parker, N. J.
Ashbrook	Dwight	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker, S. Dak.
Bannon	Ellis, Mo.	Kennedy, Ohio	Parsons
Barclay	Esch	Knopf	Payne
Bartholdt	Focht	Knowland	Perkins
Bates	Foss	Küstermann	Pray
Beale, Pa.	Foulkrod	Langley	Prince
Bede	Fowler	Lanier	Reeder
Birdsall	Fuller	Law	Reynolds
Bonyng	Gaines, W. Va.	Lawrence	Roberts
Booher	Gardner, Mich.	Lindbergh	Rodenberg
Brownlow	Gill	Longworth	Smith, Mich.
Burke	Gillett	Lovering	Southwick
Burleigh	Gobel	Lowden	Sperry
Burton, Ohio	Gordon	McCall	Stafford
Butler	Greene	McCreary	Sterling
Campbell	Haggott	McGavin	Sturgiss
Capron	Hamilton, Iowa	McGuire	Sulloway
Cary	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinlay, Cal.	Sulzer
Caulfield	Hamlin	McKinley, Ill.	Tawney
Chapman	Hammond	McKinney	Thistlewood
Conner	Haskins	McLachlan, Cal.	Thomas, Ohio
Cook, Pa.	Haugen	McLaughlin, Mich.	Tirrell
Cooper, Pa.	Hawley	Malby	Tou Velle
Cooper, Wis.	Helm	Mann	Volstead
Cousins	Henry, Conn.	Marshall	Waldo
Cox, Ind.	Higgins	Miller	Washburn
Crumpacker	Hill, Conn.	Mondell	Weeks
Cushman	Holliday	Moon, Pa.	Wilson, Ill.
Dalzell	Howell, Utah	Morse	Wood
Darragh	Hubbard, Iowa	Mouser	Woodyard
Davis, Minn.	Hubbard, W. Va.	Mudd	Young

## NAYS—94.

Aiken	Carter	Glass	Houston
Bartlett, Ga.	Clayton	Granger	Hughes, N. J.
Bartlett, Nev.	Cooper, Tex.	Hackett	Hull, Tenn.
Beall, Tex.	Cravens	Hackney	Humphreys, Miss.
Bell, Ga.	Crawford	Hamill	James, Ollie M.
Bowers	Denver	Hardwick	Johnson, Ky.
Brodhead	Ellerbe	Hardy	Johnson, S. C.
Brundidge	Fitzgerald	Harrison	Keliber
Burgess	Floyd	Hay	Kitchin, Claude
Burleson	Foster, Ill.	Heflin	Lamar, Mo.
Burnett	Gaines, Tenn.	Henry, Tex.	Leake
Byrd	Garner	Hill, Miss.	Lee
Candler	Garrett	Hitchcock	Legare
Carlin	Gillespie	Hobson	Lever

Lewis	O'Connell	Robinson	Smith, Tex.
Lloyd	Padgett	Rothermel	Spight
McHenry	Page	Rucker	Stanley
McLain	Peters	Russell, Mo.	Stephens, Tex.
Macon	Pou	Russell, Tex.	Thomas, N. C.
Maynard	Rainey	Shackelford	Watkins
Moon, Tenn.	Ransdell, La.	Sheppard	Webb
Moore, Tex.	Rauch	Sherley	Williams
Murphy	Reld	Sherwood	
Nicholls	Richardson	Slayden	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—12.

Adamson	Currier	Goulden	Lamb
Bennet, N. Y.	Dixon	Howland	Sims
Cockran	Ferris	Jenkins	Slemp

## NOT VOTING—134.

Acheson	Ellis, Oreg.	Jones, Va.	Randell, Tex.
Andrus	Englebright	Kimball	Rhinock
Ansberry	Fairchild	Kinkaid	Riordan
Barchfeld	Fassett	Kipp	Ryan
Bennett, Ky.	Favrot	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Sabath
Bingham	Finley	Knapp	Saunders
Boutell	Flood	Lafean	Scott
Boyd	Fordney	Lamar, Fla.	Sherman
Bradley	Fornes	Landis	Small
Brantley	Foster, Ind.	Lassiter	Smith, Cal.
Brick	Foster, Vt.	Lenahan	Smith, Iowa
Broussard	French	Lilly	Smith, Mo.
Brumm	Fulton	Lindsay	Snapp
Burton, Del.	Gardner, Mass.	Littlefield	Sparkman
Calder	Gardner, N. J.	Livingston	Steenerson
Calderhead	Gilhams	Lorimer	Stevens, Minn.
Caldwell	Gedwin	Loud	Talbott
Chaney	Goldfogle	Loudenslager	Taylor, Ala.
Clark, Fla.	Graff	McDermott	Taylor, Ohio
Clark, Mo.	Graham	McMillan	Townsend
Cocks, N. Y.	Gregg	McMorran	Underwood
Cole	Griggs	Madden	Vreeland
Cook, Colo.	Gronna	Madison	Wallace
Coudrey	Hale	Moore, Pa.	Wanger
Craig	Hall	Olcott	Watson
Davenport	Harding	Olmsted	Weems
Davey, La.	Hayes	Overstreet	Weisse
Davidson	Hepburn	Patterson	Wheeler
Dawes	Hinshaw	Pearre	Wiley
De Armond	Howard	Pollard	Willett
Driscoll	Howell, N. J.	Porter	Wilson, Pa.
Dunwell	Huff	Powers	Wolf
Edwards, Ga.	Hughes, W. Va.	Pratt	
Edwards, Ky.	Jackson	Pujo	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the session:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Until further notice:

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. CRAIG.

For this vote:

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. GREGG.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. CALDER with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. FAVROT.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey with Mr. DE ARMOND.

Mr. SMITH of California with Mr. FERRIS.

For balance of day:

Mr. CHANEY with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. BURTON of Delaware with Mr. FULTON.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. COCKRAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 124, noes 75.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to save the time of the House, I would like to have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 138, nays 98, answered "present" 16, not voting 136, as follows:

## YEAS—138.

Adair	Burton, Ohio	Darragh	Gaines, W. Va.
Alexander, N. Y.	Butler	Davis, Minn.	Gardner, Mich.
Ames	Campbell	Dawson	Gardner, N. J.
Anthony	Capron	Denby	Gillett
Bannon	Carter	Dickema	Goebel
Barclay	Cary	Douglas	Greene
Bartholdt	Caulfield	Draper	Haggott
Beale, Pa.	Chapman	Driscoll	Hale
Birdsall	Conner	Durey	Hamilton, Mich.
Bonyng	Cook, Pa.	Dwight	Haskins
Boyd	Cooper, Wis.	Englebright	Haugen
Bradley	Cousins	Fordney	Hawley
Brownlow	Crumpacker	Foss	Hay
Burke	Cushman	Foulkrod	Henry, Conn.
Burleigh	Dalzell	Fuller	Higgins

Hill, Conn.	Laning	Mudd	Stafford
Holliday	Law	Murdock	Steenerson
Howell, N. J.	Lindbergh	Needham	Sterling
Howell, Utah	Lovering	Nelson	Sturgiss
Hubbard, Iowa	Lowden	Norris	Sulloway
Hubbard, W. Va.	McCall	Nye	Sulzer
Hull, Iowa	McCreary	Parker, N. J.	Tawney
Humphrey, Wash.	McGavin	Parker, S. Dak.	Taylor, Ala.
James, Addison D.	McGuire	Parsons	Thistlewood
Jones, Wash.	McKinlay, Cal.	Payne	Thomas, Ohio
Kahn	McKinley, Ill.	Perkins	Tirrell
Kelfer	McKinney	Pollard	Tou Velle
Kennedy, Iowa	McLachlan, Cal.	Pray	Volstead
Kennedy, Ohio	Malby	Prince	Washburn
Kinkaid	Mann	Reeder	Weeks
Knopf	Marshall	Reynolds	Wilson, Ill.
Knowland	Miller	Rodenberg	Wood
Kuftermann	Mondell	Scott	Woodyard
Lamb	Moon, Pa.	Smith, Iowa	
Langley	Mouser	Snapp	

NAYS—98.

Aiken	Garner	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Bartlett, Ga.	Garrett	James, Ollie M.	Reid
Bartlett, Nev.	Gill	Johnson, S. C.	Richardson
Beall, Tex.	Gillespie	Jones, Va.	Robinson
Bell, Ga.	Glass	Kelher	Rothermel
Bowers	Goulden	Kitchin, Claude	Rucker
Brodhead	Granger	Lamar, Mo.	Russell, Mo.
Brundidge	Gregg	Leake	Russell, Tex.
Burleson	Hackett	Lee	Saunders
Byrd	Hackney	Legare	Shackelford
Candler	Hamill	Lever	Sheppard
Carlin	Hamilton, Iowa	Lewis	Sherley
Clark, Mo.	Hamlin	Lloyd	Slayden
Clayton	Hammond	McHenry	Smith, Tex.
Cox, Ind.	Hardwick	Maynard	Sparkman
Cravens	Hardy	Moon, Tenn.	Splight
Crawford	Harrison	Moore, Tex.	Stanley
De Armond	Helm	Murphy	Stephens, Tex.
Denver	Henry, Tex.	Nicholls	Thomas, N. C.
Ellerbe	Hill, Miss.	O'Connell	Watkins
Favrot	Hitchcock	Padgett	Webb
Fitzgerald	Hobson	Page	Wiley
Floyd	Houston	Peters	Williams
Foster, Ill.	Hughes, N. J.	Pou	
Gaines, Tenn.	Hull, Tenn.	Randell, Tex.	

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—16.

Adamson	Ferris	Jenkins	Sims
Bennet, N. Y.	Griggs	Longworth	Smith, Mich.
Currier	Hefflin	Macon	Talbot
Dixon	Howland	Rainey	Wanger

NOT VOTING—136.

Acheson	Davey, La.	Huff	Pearre
Alexander, Mo.	Davidson	Hughes, W. Va.	Porter
Allen	Dawes	Jackson	Powers
Andrus	Dunwell	Johnson, Ky.	Pratt
Ansberry	Edwards, Ga.	Kimball	Pujo
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ky.	Kipp	Ransdell, La.
Barchfeld	Ellis, Mo.	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rhinock
Bates	Ellis, Oreg.	Knapp	Riordan
Bede	Esch	Lafean	Roberts
Bennett, Ky.	Fairchild	Lamar, Fla.	Ryan
Bingham	Fasett	Landis	Sabath
Booher	Finley	Lassiter	Sherman
Boutell	Flood	Lawrence	Sherwood
Brantley	Focht	Lenahan	Slomp
Brick	Fornes	Lilley	Small
Broussard	Foster, Ind.	Lindsay	Smith, Cal.
Brumm	Foster, Vt.	Littlefield	Smith, Mo.
Burgess	Fowler	Livingston	Southwick
Burnett	French	Lorimer	Sperry
Burton, Del.	Fulton	Loud	Stevens, Minn.
Calder	Gardner, Mass.	Loudenslager	Taylor, Ohio
Calderhead	Gilham	McDermott	Townsend
Caldwell	Godwin	McLain	Underwood
Chaney	Goldfogle	McLaughlin, Mich.	Vreeland
Clark, Fla.	Gordon	McMillan	Waldo
Cockran	Graft	McMorran	Wallace
Cocks, N. Y.	Graham	Madden	Watson
Cole	Gronna	Madison	Weems
Cook, Colo.	Hall	Moore, Pa.	Weisse
Cooper, Pa.	Harding	Morse	Wheeler
Cooper, Tex.	Hayes	Olcott	Willett
Coudrey	Hepburn	Overstreet	Wilson, Pa.
Craig	Hinshaw	Patterson	Wolf
Davenport	Howard		Young

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. WALDO with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. GRAFF with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. BRUMM with Mr. McLAIN.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. BURGESS.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.

Mr. BEDE with Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri.

Mr. BATES with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

For balance of day:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. GORDON.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAINES of West Virginia in the chair). The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota moves—

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, the previous question was ordered on the motion—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Regular order.

Mr. TAWNEY. To limit debate or close debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. TAWNEY. And go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The House has closed debate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was that motion to close debate that the previous question was demanded upon.

Mr. TAWNEY. The previous question was demanded on both.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 95, noes 65.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 225, nays 7, answered "present" 16, not voting 140, as follows:

YEAS—225.

Adair	Draper	James, Addison D.	Page
Aiken	Durey	Johnson, S. C.	Parker, N. J.
Alexander, Mo.	Dwight	Jones, Va.	Payne
Alexander, N. Y.	Ellerbe	Jones, Wash.	Perkins
Allen	Englebright	Keifer	Peters
Ames	Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Pou
Anthony	Favrot	Kennedy, Ohio	Pray
Bannon	Fitzgerald	Kinkaid	Prince
Barclay	Floyd	Kitchin, Claude	Rainey
Bartholdt	Foss	Knopf	Randell, Tex.
Bartlett, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Knowland	Ransdell, La.
Bartlett, Nev.	Foulkrod	Kuftermann	Rauch
Bates	Fowler	Lafean	Reeder
Beale, Pa.	Fuller	Lamb	Reid
Beall, Tex.	Gaines, Tenn.	Langley	Reynolds
Bell, Ga.	Gaines, W. Va.	Law	Richardson
Birdsall	Gardner, Mich.	Lawrence	Roberts
Bonyne	Gardner, N. J.	Leake	Robinson
Boyer	Garner	Lee	Rodenberg
Brownlow	Gillet	Legare	Rucker
Brundidge	Glass	Lewis	Russell, Mo.
Burgess	Goebel	Lindbergh	Russell, Tex.
Burke	Granger	Longworth	Scott
Burleigh	Gregg	Loud	Shackelford
Burleson	Hackett	Lloyd	Sheppard
Burnett	Hackney	Lovering	Sherley
Burton, Ohio	Haggott	Lowden	Sherwood
Butler	Hale	McCall	Slayden
Byrd	Hall	McGuire	Slomp
Caldwell	Hamill	McHenry	Smith, Iowa
Campbell	Hamilton, Iowa	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Tex.
Candler	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinley, Ill.	Southwick
Capron	Hamlin	McKinney	Sperry
Carlin	Hammond	McLachlan, Cal.	Splight
Caulfield	Hardwick	McLain	Stafford
Chapman	Hardy	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stanley
Clayton	Haskins	Macon	Steenerson
Conner	Haugen	Malby	Stephens, Tex.
Cook, Colo.	Hawley	Mann	Suloway
Cook, Pa.	Hay	Marshall	Sulzer
Cooper, Tex.	Hefflin	Maynard	Tawney
Cousins	Helm	Miller	Thistlewood
Cox, Ind.	Henry, Tex.	Mondell	Thomas, N. C.
Crumpacker	Higgins	Moon, Tenn.	Thomas, Ohio
Cushman	Hill, Miss.	Moore, Tex.	Tou Velle
Dalzell	Hitchcock	Morse	Volstead
Darragh	Hobson	Mouser	Washburn
Davidson	Houston	Mudd	Watkins
Davis, Minn.	Howell, Utah	Murdock	Weeks
Dawson	Hubbard, Iowa	Murphy	Williams
De Armond	Hubbard, W. Va.	Needham	Wilson, Ill.
Denby	Huff	Nelson	Wood
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Nicholls	Woodyard
Diekema	Hull, Iowa	Norris	Young
Douglas	Hull, Tenn.	Nye	
	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Connell	
	Jackson	Padgett	

NAYS—7.

Harrison	James, Ollie M.	Kelher	Rothermel
Humphreys, Miss.	Johnson, Ky.	Lamar, Mo.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—16.

Adamson	Craig	Goulden	McGavin
Bennet, N. Y.	Currier	Griggs	Sims
Carter	Dixon	Holliday	Wanger
Cary	Ferris	Jenkins	Webb

## NOT VOTING—140.

Acheson	Edwards, Ky.	Hughes, W. Va.	Powers
Andrus	Ellis, Mo.	Kahn	Pratt
Ansberry	Ellis, Oreg.	Kimball	Pujo
Ashbrook	Fairchild	Kipp	Rhinoek
Barchfield	Fassett	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Riordan
Bede	Finley	Knapp	Ryan
Bennett, Ky.	Flood	Lamar, Fla.	Sabath
Bingham	Focht	Landis	Saunders
Booher	Fordney	Laning	Sherman
Boutell	Fornes	Lassiter	Small
Bradley	Foster, Ind.	Lenahan	Smith, Cal.
Brantley	Foster, Vt.	Lever	Smith, Mich.
Brick	French	Lilley	Smith, Mo.
Brodhead	Fulton	Lindsay	Snapp
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Littlefield	Sparkman
Brumm	Garrett	Livingston	Sterling
Burton, Del.	Gilham	Lorimer	Stevens, Minn.
Calder	Gill	Loudenslager	Sturgiss
Calderhead	Gillespie	McCreary	Talbott
Chaney	Godwin	McDermott	Taylor, Ala.
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	McMillan	Taylor, Ohio
Clark, Mo.	Gordon	McMorran	Tirrell
Cockran	Graft	Madden	Townsend
Cocks, N. Y.	Graham	Madison	Underwood
Cole	Greene	Moon, Pa.	Vreeland
Cooper, Pa.	Gronna	Moore, Pa.	Waldo
Coudrey	Harding	Olcott	Wallace
Cravens	Hayes	Olmsted	Watson
Crawford	Henry, Conn.	Overstreet	Weems
Davenport	Hepburn	Parker, S. Dak.	Weisse
Davey, La.	Hill, Conn.	Parsons	Wheeler
Dawes	Hinslaw	Patterson	Wiley
Driscoll	Howard	Pearre	Willitt
Dunwell	Howell, N. J.	Pollard	Wilson, Pa.
Edwards, Ga.	Howland	Porter	Wolf

So the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. POLLARD with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. MCGAVIN with Mr. WEBB.

On this vote:

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. DAWES with Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. COCKS of New York with Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. CALDER with Mr. GILL.

Mr. COLE with Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GRAFF with Mr. CRAWFORD.

Mr. BRUMM with Mr. CRAVENS.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. BEDE with Mr. BRODHEAD.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. WALDO with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. STERLING with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. WILEY.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know how I am recorded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAINES of West Virginia). The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. MAYNARD. I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. MAYNARD. I was present and listening and did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Call the gentleman.

The name of Mr. MAYNARD was called and he voted "aye."

The result of the vote was then announced, as above recorded.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. MANN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 19955), the urgent deficiency bill. By order of the House, general debate on this bill and Senate amendments is closed.

Mr. TAWNEY. I ask the Clerk to read the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

## WAR DEPARTMENT.

Pay of the Army: "For mileage to officers and contract surgeons when authorized by law, \$50,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the deficiency in the annual appropriation—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not want to block anything, but if there is going to be any debate, I think that we should have it on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. There has been no debate on the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will suspend. Under order of the House general debate upon the Senate amendments is ended; but the committee is entitled to debate under the five-minute rule upon a motion either for concurrence or nonconcurrence in the Senate amendments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman please state his motion?

Mr. TAWNEY. I simply want to state—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I rise to a question of order. If the gentleman has the floor he must submit a motion. I rise for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. TAWNEY. I was about to make a motion that all debate on the Senate amendment just read be closed in five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order that that motion is not now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not make that motion until five minutes' debate.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have already debated the amendment.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. TAWNEY. I move that the House recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I rise to make a preferential motion. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out "fifty" and inserting "forty," so that it will read "\$40,000," and upon that I wish to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his motion in writing to the Clerk's desk to be read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out "fifty thousand" and inserting "forty thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not wait too long. The gentleman must have his amendment ready.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I have the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Does not a motion to concur, which will bring the two Houses together, take precedence over a motion to concur with an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the motion to concur with an amendment takes precedence.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no disagreement here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concur with an amendment striking out the word "fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "forty."

Mr. FITZGERALD. The object of this amendment is, if possible, to put a stop to a very improper practice that has been initiated by the President of the United States. This amendment of the Senate carries \$10,000 for the purpose of supplying a deficiency in the mileage of the Army, caused by the extraordinary so-called "horseback tests," to which the Army officers were subjected during the past year. I have in mind a case where a distinguished officer in the Engineer Corps, stationed at the city of New York in charge of harbor work, was ordered by a strenuous Executive to take this 15-mile ride. This gentleman happens to weigh something over 300 pounds. [Laughter.] He is engaged entirely in engineering work. When he is not sitting in his chair in his office, he is being carried about the harbor of New York in a boat. [Laughter.] And yet in order to determine whether he was qualified to perform the duties of his office, a strenuous President, pictures of whom seated on a horse leaping barriers have been circulated throughout the country—pictures taken by placing the camera upon the ground, so as to emphasize the height of the jump [laughter]—directed this man to go to the place appointed and if possible emulate if not outdo him in horseback riding tests. I wish I had or could use the correspondence that I am informed is on file in the War Department on this question of compelling this officer to take this test. I have been informed that the officer, when asked if he thought he could stand the ride, replied that he could, but he was not so sure about the horse. [Laughter.]

What folly! Not only do we now put surgeons in command of ships, but we make them ride horses in order to find out if they are qualified physicians. Not only do engineer officers pass examinations to see if they are qualified to conduct the ordinary engineering operations, but they must be so skilled in horseback riding that they will outdo the most proficient of that distinguished military organization known as the "Rough Riders." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I should have liked yesterday if my colleague had been in good humor, to have discussed another subject not particularly germane to this paragraph, but affecting to some extent the Chief Executive of the Union. I am inclined to believe that my colleague from New York had some information that I had a seething speech buried within my vitals upon the subject of the Chief Executive, and to prevent me being relieved of that speech he conducted a seven-hour filibuster.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I must object, and I move that all debate on the amendment, and amendments thereto, be closed in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate upon the pending Senate amendments and the amendments thereto be closed in two minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield the two minutes to the gentleman from New York. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish that my speech were a two-minute speech, but it would be impossible to do justice to the things I had in mind. But I wish now to call the attention of the House to this fact, that yesterday, during the excitement of the proceedings, I moved to strike out one of the paragraphs of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to distribute the President's message.

I have read that message carefully, the message of January 31, and I have been unable to find any reference in it to the election of the President or Vice-President or Representatives in Congress. I wished to criticize at some length the attitude of the President of the United States, his insincerity and his hypocrisy, regarding the publication of campaign contributions, and it was upon the motion to strike out that paragraph that my remarks would have been made. I think that my colleague should either read these messages himself when he prepares such resolutions or else he should be sure that the men who read them for him will read them knowingly and intelligently, and know what is in the message when preparing his resolution of distribution.

Mr. Chairman, of course I do not hope to have the motion offered by me adopted. I know that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, can order these rides, can coerce officers into taking them, can put upon the retired list, and thus make an unnecessary additional burden to the people the men well qualified to perform duties required of them. If this practice is to be extended, just think of the spectacle that will be presented when the President will command my distinguished colleague, the Republican leader, to mount a horse, go to Chevy Chase, and on horseback emulate him over the steeplechase course. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion that I made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, to concur in the Senate amendments.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Police court: For fuel, gas, laundry work, stationery, printing, preservation of records, mops, brooms, buckets, removal of ashes and refuse, telephone service, and all other incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, \$500.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, that is not in order. I understood the gentleman to couple with it the motion shutting off debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not make that motion. Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the Senate amendment involves a deficiency of \$5,000—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We have agreed to shut off debate and made a rule that debate is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee agreed to close debate on the first Senate amendment. This is the second Senate amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to supply a small deficiency in the supplies and fuel for the police department of the District of Columbia. I do not think further explanation or discussion is necessary, and I move that all debate on this Senate amendment be closed in three minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Who is responsible for this deficiency?

Mr. TAWNEY. The police department of the District of Columbia is responsible to a certain extent in that they did not, it seems, contemplate all of the expenditures in the estimates that would be necessary for the fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are these persons amenable to that celebrated statute you had passed making it a criminal offense to create a deficiency?

Mr. TAWNEY. They are not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why not?

Mr. TAWNEY. Because this is not one of the appropriations that is included in the antideficiency statute.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why was this omitted from the statute?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this amendment and the amendments thereto be closed in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on the pending Senate amendment and amendments thereto be closed in two minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concur with the following amendment: "That the Secretary of the Navy shall not use any portion of the sum appropriated for armor and armament until all the men now under furlough at the Washington Navy-Yard be restored to work."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, while I sympathize with the embarrassment of the gentleman from Virginia on account of the attitude of his side of the House toward the passage of this bill, the appropriation of \$2,000,000 for armor and armament is not before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the amendment is not germane. I therefore make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senate amendment which is now before the House for consideration relates to the police court of the District of Columbia. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia in relation to the manufacture of armor is not germane to an amendment relating to the police court in the District of Columbia, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman, I think the Chair must have misread what I sent to the desk. It must be some other paper he has read from. Perhaps it is some irrelevant matter at the head of the paper which I sent to the desk. I should like to have the Chair have read the amendment that I intended to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment which the gentleman heard read by the Clerk was an amendment relating to armor and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. CARLIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It has no relation whatever to supplies in the police court.

Mr. CARLIN. Are we discussing the question of supplies in the police court?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota—

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman, have I not two minutes in which to discuss that motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The two minutes have expired.

Mr. CARLIN. But I have not had any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota will say "aye"—

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The time in which debate was to close can not be considered as having expired while the committee has been engaged in the discussion of a point of order. The Chair does not mean to make any such rule as that, I am sure. I insist that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] is entitled to two minutes in which to discuss the motion before the committee.

Mr. CARLIN. I do not care to ask for any time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the committee recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

"Garfield Hospital: For additional amount required for isolating ward for minor contagious diseases at Garfield Hospital, \$2,000."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendment just read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to acquire information for people who have asked me recently whether when these amendments are concurred in by the House and this bill is signed the Secretary of the Navy will put back to work the 250 men laid off for ninety days on the 1st of April?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will state that what the Secretary of the Navy may do after he gets this appropriation is not within my province to state. I do not know. I only know what he said when before the committee he would do in the event the appropriation was granted.

In regard to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, that is now under consideration, I have a letter from the Commissioners of the District and also one from one of the trustees of the Garfield Hospital, showing the necessity for this deficiency appropriation of \$2,000 on account of maintaining the isolating ward in that institution during the balance of the current fiscal year. The hospital authorities in replying to the request of the Commissioner for information state that at present that deficiency appropriation is not only needed, as shown by the accompanying statement, but that the funds provided for the maintenance of the isolating ward are about exhausted and that immediate relief is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I now move to close all debate on the pending Senate amendment and amendments thereto, unless some gentleman desires a minute or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that all debate on the pending Senate amendment and amendments thereto be now closed.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the committee recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

"One-half of the foregoing amounts to meet deficiencies in the appropriations on account of the District of Columbia shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee recommend concurrence in the amendment just read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What was the necessity of this? Is not this a part of the general law, anyway?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To what part of the expenditures does this refer?

Mr. TAWNEY. It refers to the \$500 appropriated to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for fuel and supplies for the police department, and \$2,000 for the Garfield Hospital for the maintenance of the isolating ward. When appropriations like this are made, unless this provision is carried, the money would all be paid out of the Treasury instead of half out of the Treasury and half out of the revenues of the District.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the committee recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, that is the last of the Senate amendments, and I move that the committee do now rise

and report the amendments of the Senate to the House, with the recommendation of the committee that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, before we get out of the committee, what is the cause of this deficiency in armor? Why is it? We have it every year.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know where the gentleman from Tennessee was when the urgent deficiency bill passed the House. The matter was fully gone into at that time, and there has been so much unnecessary delay in the passage of these Senate amendments to-day that I do not care to take up time with any further explanations.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman to yield to me for a minute and I will tell where I was and what I was doing.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have not the time to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate can proceed only by unanimous consent. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the committee do now rise and report the amendments of the Senate to the House, with the recommendation that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19955, the urgent deficiency bill, with Senate amendments thereto, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to taking the vote upon these amendments en bloc? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, upon that I desire a ye-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 236, answered "present" 15, not voting 137, as follows:

YEAS—236.

Adair	Cushman	Hay	Lindbergh
Alken	Dalzell	Hefflin	Lloyd
Alexander, Mo.	Dawson	Helm	Lovering
Alexander, N. Y.	De Armond	Henry, Conn.	Lowden
Allen	Denby	Henry, Tex.	McCall
Ames	Denver	Higgins	McCreary
Bannon	Diekema	Hill, Conn.	McGuire
Barclay	Draper	Hill, Miss.	McKinlay, Cal.
Bartholdt	Durey	Hitchcock	McKinley, Ill.
Bartlett, Ga.	Dwight	Hobson	McKinney
Bartlett, Nev.	Ellis, Mo.	Holliday	McLachlan, Cal.
Bates	Englebright	Houston	McLain
Beale, Pa.	Esch	Howell, N. J.	McLaughlin, Mich.
Beall, Tex.	Favrot	Howell, Utah	Macon
Bede	Fitzgerald	Hubbard, Iowa	Malby
Bell, Ga.	Floyd	Hubbard, W. Va.	Mann
Bennet, N. Y.	Foss	Huff	Marshall
Birdsall	Foster, Ill.	Hughes, N. J.	Maynard
Bonyne	Foulkrod	Hull, Iowa	Miller
Booher	Fowler	Hull, Tenn.	Mondell
Bowers	Fuller	Humphrey, Wash.	Moore, Tex.
Boyd	Gaines, Tenn.	Humphreys, Miss.	Morse
Broadhead	Gaines, W. Va.	Jackson	Mouser
Brownlow	Gardner, Mich.	James, Addison D.	Mudd
Brundidge	Gardner, N. J.	Johnson, Ky.	Murdoch
Burgess	Garner	Johnson, S. C.	Murphy
Burleigh	Garrett	Jones, Va.	Needham
Burleson	Gilliespie	Jones, Wash.	Nelson
Burnett	Gillett	Kahn	Norris
Burton, Ohio	Glass	Kelher	Nye
Butler	Goebel	Kelher	O'Connell
Caldwell	Granger	Kennedy, Iowa	Padgett
Campbell	Greene	Kennedy, Ohio	Page
Candler	Gregg	Kimball	Parker, N. J.
Capron	Hackett	Kinkaid	Parsons
Carlin	Hackney	Kitchin, Claude	Payne
Carter	Haggott	Knopf	Perkins
Cary	Hale	Knowland	Peters
Caulfield	Hall	Kuermann	Pou
Chapman	Hamill	Lafear	Pray
Clark, Mo.	Hamilton, Iowa	Lamar, Mo.	Prince
Conner	Hamilton, Mich.	Lamb	Ramey
Cook, Colo.	Hamlin	Langley	Randell, Tex.
Cook, Pa.	Hammond	Lanning	Ransdell, La.
Cooper, Tex.	Hardwick	Law	Reeder
Cooper, Wis.	Hardy	Lawrence	Reid
Cousins	Harrison	Leake	Reynolds
Cox, Ind.	Haskins	Lee	Richardson
Crawford	Haugen	Legare	Robinson
Crumacker	Hawley	Lewis	Rodenberg

Rothermel  
Rucker  
Russell, Mo.  
Russell, Tex.  
Saunders  
Scott  
Sheppard  
Sherley  
Sherwood

Slayden  
Smith, Tex.  
Snapp  
Southwick  
Sperry  
Stafford  
Stanley  
Steenerson  
Stephens, Tex.

Sturgiss  
Sulloway  
Sulzer  
Tawney  
Thistlewood  
Thomas, N. C.  
Tou Velle  
Voldstead  
Vreeland  
Young

Washburn  
Watkins  
Weeks  
Wiley  
Williams  
Wilson, Ill.  
Wood  
Woodward  
Young

Adamson  
Ashbrook  
Clayton  
Craig

Davis, Minn.  
Dixon  
Douglas  
Ferris

Goulden  
Howland  
Jenkins  
McHenry

Sims  
Smith, Mich.  
Talbot

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—15.

NOT VOTING—137.

Acheson  
Andrus  
Ansberry  
Anthony  
Barchfeld  
Bennett, Ky.  
Bingham  
Boutell  
Bradley  
Brantley  
Brick  
Broussard  
Brumm  
Burke  
Burton, Del.  
Byrd  
Calder  
Calderhead  
Chaney  
Clark, Fla.  
Cockran  
Cocks, N. Y.  
Cole  
Cooper, Pa.  
Coudrey  
Cravens  
Currier  
Darragh  
Davenport  
Davey, La.  
Davidson  
Dawes  
Driscoll  
Dunwell  
Edwards, Ga.

Edwards, Ky.  
Ellerbe  
Ellis, Oreg.  
Fairchild  
Fassett  
Finley  
Flood  
Focht  
Fordney  
Fornes  
Foster, Ind.  
Foster, Vt.  
French  
Fulton  
Gardner, Mass.  
Gilhams  
Gill  
Godwin  
Goldfogle  
Gordon  
Graft  
Graham  
Griggs  
Gronna  
Harding  
Hayes  
Hepburn  
Hinshaw  
Howard  
Hughes, W. Va.  
James, Olie M.  
Kipp  
Kitchin, Wm. W.  
Knapp  
Lamar, Fla.

Landis  
Lassiter  
Lenahan  
Lever  
Lilley  
Lindsay  
Littlefield  
Livingston  
Longworth  
Lorimer  
Loud  
Loudenslager  
McDermott  
McGavin  
McMillan  
McMorran  
Madden  
Madison  
Moon, Pa.  
Moon, Tenn.  
Moore, Pa.  
Nicholls  
Olcott  
Olmsted  
Overstreet  
Parker, S. Dak.  
Patterson  
Pearre  
Pollard  
Porter  
Powers  
Pratt  
Pujo  
Rauch  
Rhinoek

Riordan  
Roberts  
Ryan  
Sabath  
Shackelford  
Sherman  
Slemp  
Small  
Smith, Cal.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Mo.  
Sparkman  
Spight  
Sterling  
Stevens, Minn.  
Taylor, Ala.  
Taylor, Ohio  
Thomas, Ohio  
Tirrell  
Townsend  
Underwood  
Waldo  
Wallace  
Wanger  
Watson  
Webb  
Weems  
Weisse  
Wheeler  
Willett  
Wilson, Pa.  
Wolf

So the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. CALDER with Mr. GILL.  
Mr. DAWES with Mr. LLOYD.  
Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.  
Mr. BURKE with Mr. BYRD.  
Mr. PARKER of South Dakota with Mr. MOON of Tennessee.  
Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. RAUCH.  
Mr. FOCHT with Mr. NICHOLLS.  
Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. SPARKMAN.  
Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. CLAYTON.  
Mr. WALDO with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

For balance of the day:

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.  
Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. ELLERBE.  
Mr. STERLING with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Until further notice:

Mr. BRUMM with Mr. CRAVENS.

For this session:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with my colleague from New York, Mr. FORNES. If my colleague were here, he would vote "aye." My own views are that way, and I have therefore voted on this roll call.

Mr. HOLLIDAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to change my vote. The gentleman with whom I am paired [Mr. WILEY] is here.

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

Mr. HOLLIDAY's name was called, and he answered "aye."

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I voted on the roll call. I desire to withdraw my vote. I paired with the gentleman from Maine, Mr. LITTLEFIELD.

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

Mr. CLAYTON's name was called, and he answered "present."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman with whom I am paired did not answer, and I wish to change my vote.

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

Mr. ADAMSON's name was called, and he answered "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania submits a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately on the adoption of this rule the House shall, without further motion, resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20063, a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia; the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with; and then, after two hours of general debate (the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority), the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule.

Mr. DALZELL. The purpose of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is to expedite the public business—

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Yesterday, on the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER], the House, by unanimous consent, fixed eight hours of debate upon this District of Columbia bill, and I make the point of order that what the House by unanimous consent has done can not be undone by report of the Committee on Rules or by the proposed action of the House if it be the action of but a majority. I would ask the Clerk to read the paragraph on page 4461 of the Record.

Mr. DALZELL. The very purpose of this resolution is to get rid of that order.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The point I make is that you can not, by a majority or by anything except unanimous consent or a unanimous vote, get rid of something done by the House by unanimous consent. That is the point I make upon the rule, and in order that I may be understood, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Clerk read the paragraph.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 20063) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the ensuing fiscal year, and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that eight hours be allowed for general debate, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON], the ranking member of the minority, and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and, pending that motion, asks unanimous consent that general debate may be limited to eight hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan. The question was taken, and the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the time of debate having been settled by unanimous consent it can not be settled otherwise by the adoption of a rule unless the rule be adopted unanimously, or unless by the unanimous consent of the House upon request.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman hold that what the House does it can not undo?

Mr. DE ARMOND. No; he does not hold that, but he holds that what the House does unanimously the Committee on Rules can not undo, and that can not be undone except by unanimous action of the House. And for one I am opposed to the adoption of the rule, and therefore it can not be unanimous.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman think that the unanimous consent given yesterday by the House is of any higher dignity than the vote which has just been announced, namely, 232 yeas to no nays?

Mr. DE ARMOND. No; I do not think that. The point I am making is this, that a proposition to undo by virtue of a rule or in any other way what the House itself has done by unanimous consent can not be entertained if anybody makes a point of order or anybody objects. In making the point of order I object, of course.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule, and overrules the point of order. The Chair does not assent to the proposition that what the House may do to-day may not be undone to-morrow. Even to the matter of where there was a vote of 232, which has just been given in the affirmative, and none in the negative, it is quite competent for the House, if it should desire to do so in a proper way, to reverse its action. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry in order to understand the position of the Chair. If I understood the Chair, then, the ruling is, that by unanimous vote the House can undo with reference to this matter what it did by unanimous consent yesterday?

The SPEAKER. The House, under the Constitution, can do anything by a majority vote.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Let me ask the Speaker about that, because I would like to understand it if I can. Does the Speaker hold that the House, by a majority vote, can undo what the House by a unanimous consent has established with reference to a particular matter?

The SPEAKER. Yes; it can if the motion is properly made and a majority of the House, a quorum being present, should conclude to undo it.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, let me ask the Speaker this: Suppose that immediately after that had been settled by unanimous consent, or five or ten minutes after, there had been a motion made that debate be limited to two hours instead of the eight hours agreed upon, would the Speaker say that a majority of the House could negative the rule established by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It has to be done under a rule, and such motion would not be in order under the rules as they stand, but under the Constitution the House can make its rules and regulations, and change them, or amend them; and this, as the rules provide, is a report from the Committee on Rules, which is a privileged committee, and proposes to the House not only to do away with the unanimous consent, but to impose other terms that would exist under the rules as we now have them; and the very object of the organization of the House, with a Committee on Rules with that privilege, is to give the House an opportunity to do anything in the event the House, proceeding in an orderly way, desires so to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, not captiously, but because I think it wrong.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can hardly appeal from an answer to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would like to appeal from the ruling of the Chair on the point of order.

Mr. DALZELL. Too late.

The SPEAKER. The Chair settled the point of order; there was no appeal taken; and then the gentleman, after that matter was concluded, made a parliamentary inquiry; and the gentleman in his very interesting manner, and the Chair, to the best of the Chair's ability, in an uninteresting manner, have been holding a private conversation. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting when the Chair decides that a majority can undo what was done unanimously. That is a very interesting proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the Speaker might have added as an additional reason for his ruling that this House has gone out of the unanimous-consent business. Now, the object and purpose of this rule is to expedite the public business. It is to enable the House to go into Committee of the Whole by one roll call, and it is to provide also that it shall not be necessary that the bill be read at length, and that there shall be general debate of two hours only. I do not believe I need say anything to the House in justification of this rule. The antics of gentlemen on the other side yesterday and today demonstrate that, absolutely powerless to enact any legislation themselves, they are intending to obstruct and prevent legislation upon the part of the majority. I do not deny, Mr. Speaker, the right of the minority—the constitutional right of the minority—to perform in this manner. They have the right to spend the public time in roll calls because the Constitution has given them that right; but equally, on the other side, exists the right of the majority, charged with legislation, to put into force all its power, all the power that it has, to carry into execution its will. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] I think we will be able to demonstrate from this time out not only that the minority shall not enact any legislation, but that the legislation of the majority will be such as the majority desires to pass, in its own way, and at its own time, by exercise of the rules of this House. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] I now demand the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BURLESON. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon the previous question. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman took part of his time before demanding the previous question. If he will yield that much time to this side—

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if this general debate must be on the bill?

Mr. DALZELL. In general debate; not necessarily on the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would not be willing to yield to a motion to make it on the bill.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BURLESON. On yesterday we entered into a solemn agreement that we should have eight hours of debate. That time has been parceled out—

Mr. MANN. It has been wasted on that side.

Mr. BURLESON. By fair and square deal we ought to have that time.

Mr. MANN. It has been wasted on that side.

Mr. DALZELL. The time of the gentleman on the other side has already been more than wasted by useless roll calls. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And that side has wasted three months doing nothing, and very little of that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield for a question.

Mr. DALZELL. I decline to yield, and insist upon the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wanted to ask if you would give the same time as you have occupied yourself.

(Cries of "Regular order!")

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question.

The question was taken on ordering the previous question, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division!

The House divided, and there were—ayes 150, noes 95.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order that that is dilatory after the decided vote we have had.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the point of order?

Mr. PAYNE. That it is simply dilatory after the vote we have had.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Mississippi and let the gentleman himself determine. Does the gentleman consider his demand as a dilatory proceeding? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to usurp the place to which you have been elected. [Laughter.] I will merely reply that it seems curious to me that any intellect, even that of the gentleman from New York, should consider an effort to postpone, even for a short while, an attempt to gag a whole party as being solely dilatory. If there is any parliamentary self-defense under God's law it is that. I ask for tellers, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. As the preponderance of the vote was so large in favor of the proposition, and as the gentleman from Mississippi declines to state what the Chair, with a very ordinary intellect, as it seems to the Chair, is able to realize, the Chair feels that he is authorized to sustain the point of order. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 140, nays 100, answered "present" 13, not voting 126, as follows:

#### YEAS—140.

Adair	Douglas	Hull, Iowa	Morse
Alexander, N. Y.	Draper	Humphrey, Wash.	Monser
Allen	Driscoll	Jackson	Mudd
Ames	Durey	James, Addison D.	Needham
Bannon	Dwight	Jones, Wash.	Norris
Barclay	Ellis, Mo.	Kahn	Nye
Bartholdt	Ellis, Oreg.	Keifer	Parker, N. J.
Bates	Englebright	Kennedy, Iowa	Parsons
Beale, Pa.	Esch	Kennedy, Ohio	Payne
Bede	Focht	Kinkaid	Perkins
Birdsall	Fordney	Knopf	Pray
Bonyne	Foss	Küstermann	Prince
Boyd	Foulkrod	Lafean	Reeder
Brownlow	Fowler	Langley	Reynolds
Burleigh	Fuller	Laning	Roberts
Burton, Ohio	Gaines, W. Va.	Law	Rodenberg
Butler	Gardner, Mich.	Lawrence	Scott
Campbell	Gillett	Lilley	Slemp
Capron	Goebel	Lindbergh	Snapp
Cary	Greene	Loud	Southwick
Caulfield	Hale	Lovering	Sperry
Chapman	Hall	Lowden	Stafford
Conner	Hamilton, Mich.	McCall	Steenerson
Cook, Colo.	Haskins	McCreary	Sturgiss
Cook, Pa.	Haugen	McGuire	Sulloway
Cooper, Wis.	Hawley	McKinlay, Cal.	Tawney
Cousins	Henry, Conn.	McKinley, Ill.	Taylor, Ohio
Crumacker	Higgins	McKinney	Thomas, Ohio
Cushman	Hill, Conn.	McLachlan, Cal.	Tirrell
Dalzell	Holliday	McLaughlin, Mich.	Volstead
Darragh	Howell, N. J.	Madison	Washburn
Davidson	Howell, Utah	Malby	Wilson, Ill.
Dawson	Hubbard, Iowa	Mann	Wood
Denby	Hubbard, W. Va.	Marshall	Woodyard
Dickema	Huff	Miller	Young

## NAYS—109.

Aiken	Fitzgerald	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Alexander, Mo.	Floyd	Johnson, Ky.	Reid
Bartlett, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Johnson, S. C.	Richardson
Bartlett, Nev.	Garner	Jones, Va.	Robinson
Beall, Tex.	Garrett	Kelher	Rothermel
Bell, Ga.	Gill	Lamar, Mo.	Rucker
Booher	Gillespie	Lamb	Russell, Mo.
Bowers	Glass	Leake	Russell, Tex.
Broadhead	Granger	Lee	Saunders
Brundidge	Gregg	Legare	Sheppard
Burgess	Hackney	Lewis	Sherley
Burleson	Hamill	Lloyd	Sherwood
Burnett	Hamilton, Iowa	McHenry	Sims
Byrd	Hamlin	McLain	Slayden
Caldwell	Hammond	Macon	Smith, Tex.
Candler	Hardy	Maynard	Sparkman
Carter	Harrison	Moon, Tenn.	Spight
Clark, Mo.	Hay	Moore, Tex.	Stanley
Clayton	Heflin	Murphy	Sulzer
Cooper, Tex.	Helm	Nicholls	Taylor, Ala.
Cox, Ind.	Henry, Tex.	O'Connell	Thomas, N. C.
Craig	Hill, Miss.	Padgett	Tou Velle
Cravens	Hitchcock	Page	Watkins
Crawford	Hobson	Peters	Williams
De Armond	Houston	Pou	
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Rainey	
Favrot	Hull, Tenn.	Randell, Tex.	
		Ransdell, La.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13.

Adamson	Dixon	Howland	Wanger
Ashbrook	Ferris	Jenkins	
Bennet, N. Y.	Goulden	Shackleford	
Currier	Griggs	Smith, Mich.	

## NOT VOTING—126.

Acheson	Fairchild	Knapp	Pratt
Andrus	Fassett	Knowland	Pujo
Ansberry	Finley	Lamar, Fla.	Rhinoek
Anthony	Flood	Landis	Riordan
Barchfeld	Fornes	Lassiter	Ryan
Bennett, Ky.	Foster, Ind.	Lenahan	Sabath
Bingham	Foster, Vt.	Lever	Sherman
Boutell	French	Lindsay	Small
Bradley	Fulton	Littlefield	Smith, Cal.
Brantley	Gaines, Tenn.	Livingston	Smith, Iowa
Brick	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Smith, Mo.
Broussard	Gardner, N. J.	Lorimer	Stephens, Tex.
Brumm	Gilham	Loudenslager	Stevens, Minn.
Burke	Godwin	McDermott	Talbot
Burton, Del.	Goldfogle	McMillan	Thistlewood
Calder	Gordon	McMorran	Townsend
Calderhead	Graft	Madden	Underwood
Chaney	Graham	Mondell	Vreeland
Clark, Fla.	Gronna	Moon, Pa.	Waldo
Cockran	Hackett	Moore, Pa.	Wallace
Cocks, N. Y.	Haggott	Murdock	Watson
Cole	Harding	Nelson	Webb
Cooper, Pa.	Hayes	Olcott	Weeks
Coudrey	Hepburn	Olmsted	Weems
Davenport	Hinshaw	Overstreet	Weisse
Davey, La.	Howard	Parker, S. Dak.	Wheeler
Davis, Minn.	Hughes, W. Va.	Patterson	Willett
Dawes	James, Ollie M.	Pearre	Wilson, Pa.
Dunwell	Kimball	Pollard	Wolf
Edwards, Ga.	Kipp	Porter	
Edwards, Ky.	Kitchin, Claude	Powers	
	Kitchin, Wm. W.		

So the previous question was ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. BENNET of New York with Mr. FURNES.

On this vote:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. PARKER of South Dakota with Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. HACKETT.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Mr. WALDO with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if I am recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. WATKINS. I was in my seat and listening when my name should have been called and failed to hear it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. WATKINS, and he answered "no," as above recorded.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. HENRY of Texas) there were—ayes 136, noes 80.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 140, nays 103, answered "present" 11, not voting 134, as follows:

## YEAS—140.

Alexander, N. Y.	Bates	Brownlow	Cary
Allen	Beale, Pa.	Burleigh	Caulfield
Ames	Bede	Burton, Ohio	Chapman
Bannon	Birdsall	Butler	Conner
Barclay	Bonyng	Campbell	Cook, Colo.
Bartholdt	Boyd	Capron	Cook, Pa.

Cooper, Wis.	Hamilton, Mich.	Law	Parker, N. J.
Cousins	Haskins	Lawrence	Payne
Crumpacker	Haugen	Lilly	Perkins
Cushman	Hawley	Lindbergh	Pray
Dalzell	Henry, Conn.	Loud	Prince
Darragh	Higgins	Loving	Reeder
Dawson	Hill, Conn.	Lowden	Reynolds
Denby	Holliday	McCall	Roberts
Diekema	Howell, N. J.	McCreary	Rodenberg
Douglas	Howell, Utah	McGuire	Scott
Draper	Hubbard, Iowa	McKinlay, Cal.	Snapp
Driscoll	Hubbard, W. Va.	McKinley, Ill.	Southwick
Durey	Huff	McKinney	Sperry
Dwight	Hull, Iowa	McLachlan, Cal.	Stafford
Ellis, Mo.	Humphrey, Wash.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sturgiss
Ellis, Oreg.	Jackson	Madison	Sulloway
Englebright	James, Addison D.	Malby	Tawney
Esch	Jones, Wash.	Mann	Taylor, Ohio
Focht	Kahn	Marshall	Thistlewood
Fordney	Kelher	Miller	Thomas, Ohio
Foss	Kennedy, Iowa	Mondell	Tirrell
Foulkrod	Kennedy, Ohio	Morse	Volstead
Fuller	Kinkaid	Mouser	Vreeland
Gaines, W. Va.	Knopf	Mudd	Wanger
Gardner, Mich.	Knowland	Murdock	Washburn
Goebel	Kuftermann	Needham	Wilson, Ill.
Greene	Lafean	Nelson	Wood
Hale	Langley	Norris	Woodyard
Hall	Lanley	Nye	Young

## NAYS—103.

Adair	Denver	Hobson	Ransdell, La.
Adamson	Favrot	Houston	Rauch
Aiken	Floyd	Hughes, N. J.	Reid
Alexander, Mo.	Foster, Ill.	Hull, Tenn.	Richardson
Bartlett, Ga.	Gaines, Tenn.	Humphreys, Miss.	Robinson
Bartlett, Nev.	Garner	Johnson, S. C.	Rothermel
Beall, Tex.	Garrett	Jones, Va.	Rucker
Bell, Ga.	Gill	Kimball	Russell, Mo.
Booher	Gillespie	Kitchin, Claude	Russell, Tex.
Bowers	Glass	Lamar, Mo.	Saunders
Broadhead	Granger	Lamb	Sheppard
Brundidge	Gregg	Leake	Sherley
Burgess	Hackney	Lee	Sherwood
Burleson	Hamill	Legare	Slayden
Burnett	Hamilton, Iowa	Lewis	Smith, Tex.
Byrd	Hamlin	Lloyd	Sparkman
Caldwell	Hammond	Macon	Spight
Candler	Hardwick	Moon, Tenn.	Stanley
Carter	Hardy	Murphy	Sulzer
Clark, Mo.	Harrison	Nicholls	Taylor, Ala.
Clayton	Hay	O'Connell	Thomas, N. C.
Cooper, Tex.	Heflin	Padgett	Tou Velle
Cox, Ind.	Helm	Page	Watkins
Cravens	Henry, Tex.	Peters	Wiley
Crawford	Hill, Miss.	Pou	Williams
De Armond	Hitchcock	Randell, Tex.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.

Bennet, N. Y.	Dixon	Howland	Shackleford
Craig	Ferris	Jenkins	Smith, Mich.
Currier	Goulden	McGavin	

## NOT VOTING—134.

Acheson	Ellerbe	Kipp	Pratt
Andrus	Fairchild	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Pujo
Ansberry	Fassett	Knapp	Rainey
Anthony	Finley	Lamar, Fla.	Rhinoek
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	Landis	Riordan
Barchfeld	Flood	Lassiter	Ryan
Bennett, Ky.	Fornes	Lenahan	Sabath
Bingham	Foster, Ind.	Lever	Sherman
Boutell	Foster, Vt.	Lindsay	Sims
Bradley	Fowler	Littlefield	Slomp
Brantley	French	Livingston	Small
Brick	Fulton	Longworth	Smith, Cal.
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Lorimer	Smith, Iowa
Brumm	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Smith, Mo.
Burke	Gilham	McDermott	Steenerson
Burton, Del.	Gillett	McHenry	Stephens, Tex.
Calder	Godwin	McLain	Sterling
Calderhead	Goldfogle	McMillan	Stevens, Minn.
Carlin	Gordon	McMorran	Talbot
Chaney	Graft	Madden	Townsend
Clark, Fla.	Graham	Maynard	Underwood
Cockran	Griggs	Moon, Pa.	Waldo
Cocks, N. Y.	Gronna	Moore, Pa.	Wallace
Cole	Hackett	Moore, Tex.	Watson
Cooper, Pa.	Haggott	Olcott	Webb
Coudrey	Harding	Olmsted	Weeks
Davenport	Hayes	Overstreet	Weems
Davey, La.	Hepburn	Parker, S. Dak.	Weisse
Davidson	Hinshaw	Parsons	Wheeler
Davis, Minn.	Howard	Patterson	Willett
Dawes	Hughes, W. Va.	Pearre	Wilson, Pa.
Dunwell	James, Ollie M.	Pollard	Wolf
Edwards, Ga.	Johnson, Ky.	Porter	
Edwards, Ky.	Kelher	Powers	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the vote:

Mr. GILLET with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. HACKETT.

Mr. PARKER of South Dakota with Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES.

Mr. CALDER with Mr. CARLIN.

Mr. PARSONS with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. WALDO with Mr. KELHER.

Mr. HINSHAW with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. McMorran with Mr. McHenry.  
Mr. Cole with Mr. Rainey.  
Mr. Steenerson with Mr. McLain.  
Mr. Weeks with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Weems with Mr. Moore of Texas.

Until further notice:

Mr. Calderhead with Mr. Stephens of Texas.  
Mr. Bede with Mr. Maynard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, in pursuance of the resolution, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20063, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. Dalzell in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill. The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House the first reading of the bill has been dispensed with and general debate for two hours is now in order. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gardner] is now recognized.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would not presume on the time of the House to make any extended statement relative to the pending bill were it not that there are some unusual things attending it. In the first place, the bill reports in round numbers \$800,000 less for the current expenses for the ensuing year than was allowed for this year, and in round numbers \$4,000,000 less than the estimates for the ensuing year. Your committee feels that some statement is due relative to these measures in advance of consideration under the five-minute rule. The revenues from the District for the year for which this bill provides are estimated at \$5,900,000. The Federal Government supplements that with like amount. So that the anticipated revenues are \$11,800,000. This bill recommends an appropriation of \$9,436,289, exclusive of the revenues from the water department. I want to say that this difference is more apparent than real, as affecting the current expenses. Nearly the whole of the \$800,000 less in this bill than was carried in the one a year ago is taken up by appropriations made in the bill last year for the completion of projects then under way but not properly chargeable to the current expense fund. For example, \$550,000 of the \$800,000 was carried in the bill last year for the completion of the municipal building.

The occupancy of that building on or about the 1st of July will save the Government in excess of \$10,000 in rents, so that we have \$560,000 in that one item. Then there was carried in the bill of last year \$80,000 for a new pier at the highway bridge, \$66,000 for the Delacarla reservoir, \$44,000 for the completion of a bridge over the Baltimore and Ohio railroad on Monroe street, in the vicinity of the Catholic University, \$25,000 more for the placing of metal file cases in the office of the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia. These and several other lesser items, which were in the nature of appropriations for extraordinary projects taken from the amount last year makes the current expenses of the ensuing year about the same that they are this year. From another standpoint of view, however, the discrepancy seems even more marked, but when it is recalled that the estimates asked for \$2,000,000 more than the revenues, it leaves only an excess of a little over two million of dollars, counting what the Government gives above what the committee appropriates. You ask me to reconcile that difference. Taking out the Government's appropriation, it will leave in round numbers a million of dollars surplus. Why, is it asked, do you want that amount of surplus? We will endeavor to explain that. In the first place, for twenty-one years preceding 1901 the District government ran within its revenues every year save one, and that year there was a deficit of only \$5,000 in round numbers. There were two years during that period in which the excess of revenues over expenditures exceeded \$1,000,000. In 1901 the city entered a new era of development. Since that time, namely, within the last seven and one-half years, there have been undertaken and substantially completed several important and, upon the whole, very necessary enterprises. One of these, and the most expensive, was the establishment and installation of the new filtration system.

Another was the completion of the sewage-disposal plant. Another was the completion of the new municipal building, to which reference has been already made. Another was the completion of the present police-court building. Another was the purchase of the extensive grounds out on Fourteenth street and the rearing of a tuberculosis hospital, which will be occupied in the course of a few weeks. Another was the purchase of an extensive tract of ground at Blue Plains and the construction thereon of a home for the aged and infirm, and upon a portion of the same tract has been built a school for colored boys—a sort of reform school. The buildings are already completed, and the school is in operation.

In addition to these there has been the construction of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, the Highway Bridge, the Massachusetts Avenue Bridge, the Anacostia Bridge, and the Piney Branch Bridge. These cover, substantially, what might be termed the "extraordinary improvements" already made within the last seven and a half years. I left out two important things—the part that the city contributes toward the new Union Station and the elimination of grade crossings. I think that covers all, substantially, what might be termed the "extraordinary improvements." These have aggregated nearly \$17,000,000, of which the Government pays one half and the District of Columbia the other half. There will be on the 1st of July an unfunded debt a little in excess of \$4,000,000. On the 1st day of July, 1901, there was not a dollar of unfunded debt. In addition to the unfunded, the funded debt amounts to a little over \$11,000,000, so that the debt of the District on the 1st of July will exceed \$15,000,000.

Now, the money for the unfunded debt was secured in this way: Congress passed some years ago a law authorizing the District to borrow from the Federal Government at 2 per cent for certain improvements, the time to run for five years and payable within that limit. That limit has been extended every year, and each year the aggregate of indebtedness has increased. Your committee has felt, and now feels and recommends accordingly to this body, that inasmuch as these extraordinary improvements have been made and substantially completed, every one of them within the appropriation now allowed, and that inasmuch as there was an agreement on the part of the District to pay back that borrowed money within a specified time, we ought to begin to make good the promise of the District. And so, if this bill carries as the committee recommends, the District will be able to pay in round numbers a million dollars on the unfunded debt from the revenues of this year. It may be asked how that can be done without seriously jeopardizing the interests of the city in its current affairs. The committee believes that it can be done and done without appreciably affecting the current interests of the city. In the first place, I would like to call attention specifically to wherein we propose to make some savings, not only on the estimates, but under the estimated revenues. On page 7 of this report, you have it, if you will observe, for salaries an estimate of \$742,000 plus. This bill recommends \$649,000 plus, making a saving in the item of salaries of \$92,743, and I may say in passing that there are but few salaries increased in the entire District list. One-third of this \$92,000, in round numbers is accounted for in the difference between what was asked, namely, \$60,835, for the care of the new District building, and the amount recommended by the committee, namely, \$30,240, making a difference in the care of the District building of \$29,000 plus, and we believe, for the amount recommended, that it can be well cared for, too. If you will refer to page 9 of the report, you will find for "improvements and repairs" that the estimates are \$1,239,000, and the bill carries \$985,000, making a difference between the estimates and the recommended appropriation of \$250,000.

The principal item from which this saving arises is, first, repairs to streets, avenues, and alleys. Last year the Congress was deemed exceedingly liberal and appropriated for this purpose \$300,000. The estimates for the ensuing year are \$400,000. Your committee recommends \$300,000, or the same amount as last year. For repairs of county roads the committee recommends \$100,000. The estimates were \$125,000, and last year we had, in addition, the construction of the bridge over the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, to which reference has been made. That does not appear this year. These items make up nearly the whole difference.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Assuredly.

Mr. WEEKS. I understand that there is now an unfunded debt of \$4,000,000. Is that entirely carried by the Government?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. On the 1st day of July the whole of it will be carried by the Government, and between three and four million dollars at this time.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the District pay the Government interest on this money?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Two per cent. The next item represents a large amount, and I would like to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole House to this. It is found on page 12, and estimates for schools \$1,147,500. The amount recommended in this bill is \$2,401,000. The difference between the recommended appropriation and the estimates is \$1,746,000.

The estimates for new buildings alone call for \$1,936,000. The committee recommends in direct appropriation \$354,500, and an authorization for enough more to bring this up to \$533,500. Last year the Congress gave \$535,000 for construction of new buildings—\$80,000 in excess of the estimates. The com-

mittee believed then that they had gone to the extreme liberality in this respect. This year, as I say, the estimates are nearly \$2,000,000 for this purpose. The committee recommend in direct appropriation an authorization substantially the same as last year. There was another thing that controlled the action of the committee, in part, touching this matter. There was appointed a commission to investigate carefully as to the best type of school buildings and report. That report has not yet been made, and your committee believed that until that report is made and investigated and really accepted, it is better to go conservatively than extravagantly in the matter of new buildings relative to the schools. Then, again, that commission is required to report a general plan for the consolidation of the public schools in the District of Columbia, and the abandonment and sale of such school buildings and sites as may by them be deemed necessary and desirable for the best good of the public school service. So that, for these various reasons, it was thought best to keep within the limits named.

In the Health Department there is a difference between the estimates and the recommended appropriations of \$92,000. There is a saving of \$70,000 in these four estimates, namely, removal of weeds, site for pound, erection and equipment of pound, and stable for smallpox hospital. Your committee believes that there is not a single one of these but that can go for another year, with the possible exception of the cutting of the weeds, without a special appropriation, and no interest suffer materially thereby.

Mr. CRUMPACKER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I notice an estimate for the salaries of the Metropolitan police of \$1,021,413.25, and that the appropriation recommended is \$915,293.35.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. What page is that on?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is on page 12 of the report.

It follows the item of public schools in the order of arrangement on page 12 of the report. There has been considerable discussion in the newspapers and otherwise in relation to the inadequacy of the police in the city of Washington. I would like to know of the gentleman from Michigan if the safety of people upon the streets of the city was duly considered in recommending the appropriation that is carried in the bill of something over \$100,000 less than the estimates made by the Commissioners in the point of salaries?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If the gentleman will allow me, I will be very glad to take that up as the last item instead of in the order it appears here.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would not have called the gentleman's attention to it now excepting for the fact that in the arrangement on page 12 it comes after the schools. If the gentleman intends to take it up later, of course that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes; I will be glad to do that later. Another item in which there is very material reduction is that of streets, on page 9 of the report. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$491,000. The estimates for this purpose were \$904,000. Now, in this we find for playgrounds, the purchase of sites, \$186,000; for grading and improving Rosedale site, \$5,000; for construction of bath houses and purchase of sites, \$94,500; for drilling wells and maintenance of same, \$5,000. These several items make up a very large per cent of the difference between the estimates and the recommendations by the committee. It will be remembered that last year the Congress gave \$75,000 for the purchase of playground sites. It was then rumored on the floor of the House that there was a purpose in view to expend \$1,000,000, at least, in the matter of playgrounds in the city. Many did not give credence to that rumor at the time, but here we have exceeding \$200,000 in the estimates for this year in addition to what was given last year for this purpose. And if the estimates are borne out by the Congress, it will not be long until there is a million of dollars invested in playgrounds and playground sites and equipment in the city.

There is a very material saving also in the matter of corrections and charities of \$310,000.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I occupied?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I thank the Chair. I would like to know when I get within ten minutes of the time allotted, if I do not finish before.

In this item you will find that the estimates carried \$100,000 for an additional building to the so-called "municipal hospital," for the purpose of caring for chronic patients. The committee believed that with the various and many hospitals in the city, with the new hospital building just completed out at the municipal plant, and which will release a number of wards now occupied by tuberculosis patients for other patients in the Washington Asylum Hospital, that it is not necessary to build that structure at this time. The same may be said in regard to the workhouse, an additional building recommended at \$110,000. These two items alone take the major portion of the difference between the estimates and the amount recommended in the bill.

Now, I would like to recur to the point raised by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], on page 12 of the report—Metropolitan police. There was, perhaps, no one thing to which the committee gave more careful consideration than this. As the gentleman from Indiana has well said, the press of the city has called attention to the inadequacy of the police force, to its failure to properly protect the people of the District, and to the necessity for a large increase of the force. It was because of that general public interest that the committee gave more than ordinary attention to this feature of the bill.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I desire to present some figures along this line, in no sense to be construed as a reflection upon the police department of the city. We have no quarrel with that department whatever as to its administration; but it is due the House and due the committee to make a statement as to why the clamor of 100 additional policemen was not recognized in the bill. I may say at the outset that there were no additional policemen allowed, the bill carrying the same number as did the bill last year. The committee went carefully into an investigation as to the police in certain cities of relative size and in others having a corresponding colored population. It was contended that it was because of the large colored population that there were so many arrests, that the police were kept so active in the pursuit of their duties, and that the lawlessness of that element in the community required a larger force. We are not prepared to deny that there is something of truth in these declarations. On the other hand, the committee ascertained the cost of the police force in the city of Washington, as compared with other cities of its class, as well as the number of policemen in this city, compared with cities of like population. Among other things we found this: That Baltimore has a population of 508,000 people, that it has a police force of 701, that its police force costs the city of Baltimore \$1.95 per capita. Washington, with a population of 278,000—these comparisons are all taken from the Census reports, 1900, and special reports obtained by the Census Department.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman if he claims that the population is only 278,000? When were the comparisons made?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. They were all made in 1900, the last census; so that the basis of comparison is absolutely fair, you see. At the time these comparisons were made Washington had 278,000 population, with a police force of 467. It now has a force of 719. It cost the District of Columbia and the United States Government then \$3.18 per capita, as against \$1.95 in Baltimore. The nearest approach to the number of policemen in any city in the country, investigated and compared with Washington, was Buffalo with a population of 352,000, with a police force of 549 and a per capita cost of \$2.14. But it must be remembered that Buffalo is one of the most important ports on the chain of the Great Lakes and has a large element in all of the sailing, and probably in the non-sailing, season that would be classed as turbulent people. We found again that Milwaukee, with 285,000 people, has 247 policemen and a cost per capita of \$1.25.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask the gentleman to what he attributes the very large increased cost per capita for the police in Washington as compared with the cities he has spoken of?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think I will come to that a little later in the order of my statement.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not want to interrupt the order of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. There has been much talk about the colored population. Memphis, 48 per cent colored; Washington 31 per cent. In Memphis they have, with 102,000 population, 76 policemen, at a cost to that city of \$1.14 per capita, a small fraction more than a third as much as it costs the city of Washington. Atlanta has a population of 39 per cent colored as against Washington's 31. Atlanta, with 89,000 population, has a police force of 178 and a per capita

cost of \$1.78. Richmond has 38 per cent of its people colored. Its police force is 71, far less than Washington in proportion to population. Its cost is \$1.34 per capita. Nashville, with a population of 80,000 and 37 per cent colored has a police force of 79—far less than Washington proportionately—and a cost per capita of \$1.17.

Now, another thing. It is said that the police here are so vigilant in the matter of arrests. Richmond, with a population of 89,000, had 819 arrests per 10,000, as against Washington's 1,087. Atlanta, with its 178 policemen, had 1,674 arrests to every 10,000. Nashville, with its 79 policemen, made 1,228 arrests to every 10,000. Charleston, with 55,000 people, made 1,527 arrests, with a small force of police. Now, it does not fairly represent the police force of the city when it is said that the Metropolitan police covers the whole, nor does it fairly represent the police force if the impression were left on the minds of the committee that it has the use of the entire Metropolitan force. There are detailed in and about the White House and grounds 44 members of the Metropolitan police, reducing the force by that number. But over against that, the Government polices all its reservations in this city, this Capitol and its grounds, the Smithsonian Institution and its grounds, the Navy, War, and State Department building, and every other department in the city which is under national control, the Congressional Library, the parks, outside of Rock Creek Park, being policed by a force paid in part by the National Government. Now, in addition to that, the railroads police the crossings, wherever the Commissioners determine that policemen are necessary, and they pay for those police. Although these policemen are paid by the railroads, they are required to report to the superintendent of police and are under his direction, and if we did not have them the city would have to provide them.

Mr. AMES. You say the railroads. Do you mean the steam railroads?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes; at their crossings.

Mr. BONYNGE. Do the street railroads pay the policemen at their crossings?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; that is what they complain of.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Smith informs me that the street railways likewise furnish crossings policemen.

Mr. LEAKE. I have noticed on the streets of Washington a number of very elderly gentlemen wearing the uniform of the Washington police, and wearing long flowing coats which look more like petticoats. Now, I want to know whether there is any age limit for the retirement of the police force?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think on the Metropolitan police force there is, but on the street-crossing police, paid for by the railroads, I am inclined to think there is no age limit.

Mr. LEAKE. These policemen who are paid for by the railroads, do they come under the general supervision of the police department?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. They are under the direction of the chief of police and report to him; so that the Government policemen and the railroad policemen more than make good the detail from the Metropolitan police at the White House and grounds.

Mr. TIRRELL. Can the gentleman tell us about what the average increase in population in Washington is yearly?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. No; I am sorry to say I gave no attention to those statistics.

Mr. TIRRELL. I have heard it said that the annual increase is about five thousand. Can the gentleman also inform us as to the average number of new buildings that have gone up in Washington yearly during the last few years?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. No; I can not tell you that, but the number is large.

Mr. TIRRELL. Does not the gentleman think that if there is that large annual increase, both in population and buildings, and if the number of policemen last year was requisite for the work and just about right, there should be some increase, though it may be small, each year?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Has the gentleman from Michigan admitted that we did not have too many last year?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. There has been a material increase. I think there are on the force now 719 officers and privates in addition to reenforcement from the two sources to which I have referred.

Mr. TIRRELL. Now, one question more which it seems to me of great importance. Do not policemen in the city of Washington, on account of its large territory compared with the cities of Boston or Baltimore, have to cover a great deal more ground, or else not cover it at all, and therefore is it not necessary that there should be, on account of this being a city of magnificent

distances, more policemen to cover that ground than would be necessary in either Baltimore or Boston?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I was coming to that and with it conclude my statement: It is due to the police force and to the Commissioners to say that the scope of their activities is as large as the District of Columbia, and that these outlying points are policed; they have a mounted police and a large force of bicycle policemen, the bicycle policemen, however, being used largely in the city. But when you grant all that it still remains that there is not a city in the United States that has the per capita police force that the city of Washington and the District of Columbia has at this time, nor is there one of its class that costs anything like as much per capita. The next largest is Buffalo, which is more than \$1 less per capita in expense. The salaries are higher here, I can not tell you how much, but materially higher than elsewhere.

As will be brought out in the near future, the pension system has grown up to be a great tax upon somebody. Pensions on the force go as high as \$100 a month. Widows get as high as \$50 a month. Soldiers perforated with bullets get \$30 a month. That gentleman's father [pointing to Representative AMES], a major-general in the Army, under the law is entitled to \$30 a month if he wants it. A retired police officer who never fired a shot, or perhaps a shot was never fired at him, may draw \$100 a month pension. The widow of a soldier dead on the battlefield gets \$12 a month if the Salloway bill becomes a law—as I hope it will—otherwise, she gets \$8; but the wife of a dead policeman in Washington may get as high as \$50 a month. Widows of the privates get from \$20 to \$30 per month. Those are some of the reasons why this great expense exists.

Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. How much time, Mr. Chairman, have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twelve minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I would prefer that the gentleman would ask his questions under the five-minute rule when we reach those subjects.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; I will postpone them until then.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi thirty minutes, or so much of that time as he wants to occupy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will need that length of time to curry this particular horse. This morning by a parliamentary device—I will not say by a parliamentary trick, because I want to be always courteous—the gentleman from Pennsylvania shut off the privilege of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], and my privilege, as members of the Committee on Rules, of making any response at all to the statement which he made to the country of the present situation in the House, and that course of conduct followed after the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] and I had given to the Committee on Rules a quorum to do business, when one Republican member of that committee was too ill to attend and the other two did not constitute a quorum.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some rather strong language has been indulged in, both by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. We have been held up as "filibusterers" before the country. The gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to our resorting to our constitutional right to call for the yeas and nays for the passage of measures through the House as "queer antics before the country."

Mr. Chairman, we have not filibustered. [Laughter on the Republican side.] We have broken no quorum, either in the House or in the Committee on Rules. And nobody is better aware of that fact than the two gentlemen who have used that language. A filibusterer in a parliamentary sense is a man that is engaged in the business of preventing legislation. We have been engaged in the business of trying to force legislation at the hands of the majority. [Applause on the Democratic side; laughter on the Republican side.] Nobody, no party, can filibuster when furnishing to the floor of the House its own proportion of a quorum. I doubt if all day yesterday and last night the Republican party had here, even if there had been added a sufficient number of Members on the Democratic side to call for the yeas and nays, a quorum in this House, and I know that this morning they had no quorum in the Committee on Rules, the very committee which reported out this rule. Do not understand me as complaining, Mr. Chairman; nor shall I apologize. The minority will exhaust every power it has under the general rules of this House. It will exhaust every power that it has under every special rule that you have the power to bring into this House to force out of you, if it can,

legislation in the interests of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So much in the interest of the people that your own chosen President has in several cases indorsed it, and so much in the interest of the people that your Committee on Ways and Means and your Committee on Rules dare not permit the very measures we have in our programme stressed to come before this House for fear a majority of the Republican party in this House would adopt them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am glad to see a few first fruits. I hear that an employers' liability bill has been finally reported out of the Judiciary Committee. I congratulate you gentlemen upon the Democratic side upon that fact. [Laughter on the Republican side.] That it might have been reported out at a later date is perhaps true, and that you on the Republican side would have been delighted to have kept it a while longer in committee as a buffer against other much needed and desired and beneficial legislation, also, I have no doubt; but the report of the employers' liability bill out of the Judiciary Committee is the first fruit, but only the first fruit, not the greatest. A new light, as a second fruit, has been shed, which in its effect upon man was never exceeded since Saul of Tarsus was turned into St. Paul on his way to Damascus. The Speaker of this House has seen the light. I see from this morning's paper that the Speaker does not propose to let the Republican Executive have a monopoly of criticising the Republican legislative part of this Government, but that he proposes, as spokesman and head of the legislative branch of the Republican Administration, to do a little criticising himself; this time, of the executive branch. Mr. Chairman, some time ago, in his message, the Executive read the riot act to the legislative part of the Republican party for failure to act and neglect of civic duty. I need not now dwell upon the various things to which he called attention, some of them good and some of them bad, because I have in a previous speech gone all over that.

I agreed with him in a part of his arraignment, and when, this morning or yesterday, by introduction of a resolution into this House, the Speaker of this House accuses the Republican executive department of failure to do its duty in stamping out a predatory trust, I agree also with the Speaker. I am proud of the fact that I can agree, when in their lucid intervals, with both branches of the Republican party. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The President was right when he said you had neglected your legislative duties in connection with the various measures to which he called your attention, some of which we hope, with his assistance, to corkscrew out of you before this Congress is over [applause on the Democratic side], and the Speaker was exactly right when he said that the executive department had neglected its duty when it had failed to make use of the evidence which the country possessed—perhaps already collected in the Department of Commerce and Labor—to prove the existence of a paper trust in this country and to put an end to the same.

Mr. Chairman, I read from this morning's Post, and I leave it to gentlemen to determine for themselves if this is not a conversion almost as great as that of Saul into St. Paul; the Speaker has introduced a resolution which reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be directed, if not incompatible with the public service, to transmit to the House all papers and information which may be in the possession of the Department relating to any steps which may have been taken by the Bureau of Corporations to make the "diligent investigation into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of the International Paper Company of New York, and other corporations, joint stock companies, or combinations engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp or print paper, or the sale thereof, as said Bureau of Corporations is authorized to do by law of the United States, and all papers and information in his Department which are the result of such investigation, if any such has been made."

I read now from the article in the Washington Post of this morning:

Much significance is attached to the action of Speaker CANNON yesterday, in his capacity as a Member of the House, introducing a resolution directing the Department of Commerce and Labor to report to the House what investigation, if any, it has made into the business of the International Paper Company or other combination engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp and print papers, and also directing the Department of Justice to report what steps, if any, have been taken looking to the prosecution of these corporations for their alleged violations of the Sherman antitrust law.

The position of the author of these resolutions in the House of Representatives is sufficient guaranty that they will be promptly reported and adopted by the House. These resolutions also are important for the reason they indicate that Speaker CANNON holds to the view that the increase in the cost of print paper is due not so much to the protective tariff as it is to combinations in restraint of trade. Mr. CANNON evidently believes that if the Departments charged with the administration and enforcement of the antitrust law enforce it rigorously this combination can be put out of business, and the price of paper to the publishers, as a consequence, will be greatly reduced.

That is another so-called "Republican piece of proposed legislation" that I have the honor to announce that the Demo-

cratic side of this House will support to the full extent. The Democratic members of the committee will take pleasure in reporting out the Speaker's resolution, and the Democratic Members of this House will take pleasure in voting for it when it gets here.

Mr. Chairman, upon the other day the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] referred to the tactics that we were pursuing upon this side as "puerile" and "hypocritical." I have sometimes thought, and I say it in all good humor, that there is a large degree of comparison, although some degree of contrast, between my friend, the honorable SERENO E. PAYNE, of New York, and that distinguished knight of the days of Prince Hal who was known to his friends as Honest Jack Falstaff and to strangers as Sir John Falstaff. In breadth of girth there is much of comparison. They both "lard the lean earth" as they walk across it. In adopting Sir Jack's maxim that "discretion is the better part of valor," there is much of comparison, because the gentleman the other day, and generally indeed, manages to make the last speech when he is engaged in debate, whenever he can, so that he can not be easily and immediately replied to. Mr. Chairman, they are alike in this, too, that Prince Hal described Sir Jack as being "brave in coming on and halting in coming off" from the various enterprises which he undertook. In another part of Shakespeare's play Jack speaks of himself as being "not only witty in himself, but the cause of wit in others." [Laughter on the Democratic side.] So far as the latter part of this description—autobiographical description—of Sir Jack is concerned, the gentleman from New York resembles him closely. So far as the first paragraph of the description is concerned, it is with sincere regret and pain that I am compelled to say that there is a contrast and not a comparison, because whenever the gentleman from New York attempts to be "witty in himself" he is generally simply rude and awkwardly offensive.

It was not quite parliamentary to speak of the tactics which we were pursuing as "puerile" or "hypocritical." The gentleman should have selected some better word. However, the gentleman did not intend to be offensive in the slightest degree. He thought that he was being funny, and there is nothing funnier in the world than the gentleman from New York when he thinks he is being funny. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, this morning the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who now occupies the chair, said the object of introducing this rule was to "expedite the public business." Mr. Chairman, the real object of introducing that rule was to prevent us from forcing you to expedite public business. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every time anybody wants to pass any of this reform legislation, so much of which is desired by honest men in your own party, you cry out, "After the election! After the election! After the election!" You remind me a little bit of a piece of poetry my boy picked up the other day somewhere at the public school and brought home and recited to me and his grandmother, and of which, when he got through, his grandmother said, "Kit, you ought never to repeat that any more, because that is just about the same as telling anybody to go to the bad place." That poetry ran after this wise:

When I asked my girl to marry me, she said,  
"Go to father."  
She knew that I knew her father was dead;  
She knew that I knew the life he had led;  
She knew that I knew what she meant when she said,  
"Go to father."

[Great applause and laughter.]

And you are going back to your people, you Republicans over there—I am not talking of those now who represent "stand-pat" districts of one sort and another—but, for example, gentlemen from Minnesota, one of whose laws was held up not long ago by a mere temporary restraining order of a subordinate court upon ex parte testimony, and some of you gentlemen who live in districts where the people want the tariff revised and do not want it revised by being told to "Go to father;" are you going back home and say to those people, "We were in favor of these things, but in voting against them, as we have done, we were merely following our leaders in the House of Representatives, and we are still going to do them 'after the election.'" I am afraid some of them will respond in the words of my mother-in-law and say, "Boy, do not say that any more; that sounds like telling me to wait until I go to the bad place." You have practiced this deception upon the American people so long that it would seem that "a fool who runneth" could now read it. Every time before an election you say to the people that you propose that "after the election" to do this, that, or the other thing, and then after the election you say, "The people have indorsed our not having done it, and the

people stand with us on our inactivity." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, this session when Mr. Herman Ridder on the outside and many people on the inside of Congress have urged this Congress to pass a bill putting wood pulp upon the free list and print paper there also, or at least to reduce the duty upon the latter, what has been the reply of the Republican leaders? They say, "We can not do it because if we bring a measure into the House putting wood pulp upon the free list, it will open up the whole tariff question, and the Democrats will make all sorts of amendments." I have finally succeeded in driving the majority to a demonstration of the falsity of that pretense, and I hold the demonstration in my hand as a palpable, legible, visible thing in the shape of the rule which you adopted this morning. It illustrates, it demonstrates, that you could by action of your Committee on Rules, under your peculiar general rules conferring the power which that committee has, bring into the House a bill, accompanied by a rule from the Committee on Rules and put that bill through, if you wanted it done, with three minutes' general debate and no time or opportunity for amendment under the five-minute rule at all. Bring in your rule! Let a special rule for once bring some benefit to the people. This whole country will know before this session is over that if remedial legislation can not be secured from this Congress, it will be because the minority under the general rules and under the special rule are as helpless for legislative purposes as a child shooting peas out of a muzzle-loaded shotgun at Gibraltar is impotent in an attempt to destroy the rock.

One thing we propose to demonstrate, and we are going to demonstrate it, is that we shall exhaust in our effort to obtain remedial legislation every power which the minority has under the rules. No man of honor or sense shall claim that we have failed to do that. This rule is "the first squeal," my Democratic friends, upon the Republican side. This rule is the first squeal from the other side, but it will not be the last. Talk about hypocrisy and puerility. What of the hypocrisy and puerility of this pretense that the majority in enacting desired legislation can not protect itself from the minority? They have more rules up their sleeves which they will bring in later, but as far as I am concerned I have enlisted for the war and I will stay with you here until the dog days. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Some of you think that you will intimidate or bribe members of the Democratic party by cutting men off from speeches that they want to make, because, of course, when I refuse you unanimous consent upon that side you will refuse it here, or by cutting them off from bills that they want to pass for their districts. I do not believe there is a man on this side of this Chamber ready to sell his fidelity to a general policy of substantive and beneficent legislation for the sake of a petty speech or a petty local bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If there be, I shall be much astonished.

I have heard that you have bruited it about that we should get nothing this session. Why, we are so in the habit of getting nothing and having nothing that it does not hurt us much. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Wherever one of us will be hurt one and a fraction of you will be injured, and we can stand it better than you can. Most of us who are upon this floor now are from districts where somebody may beat us for the nomination, but where no Republican is going to beat us at the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Even when a man sacrifices a seat, he sacrifices only himself; he does not sacrifice his party. But he will not by doing his duty here even sacrifice a nomination. The people will understand. It will be long before the dog days that you will be anxious, you Republicans, to be turning your way homeward to "mend your fences" and to take care of the live new Democrats with progressive spirits who are not letting any grass grow under their feet out West and in the Middle States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can not intimidate me, for one, with any special rules or with any threat of any rules. You might pass a general resolution in these words:

*Resolved*, That no motion or resolution or bill of the Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, shall be granted or become a law for nineteen months, or until the end of this Congress.

And you might bring in a special rule from the Rules Committee to put that resolution upon passage and pass it without amendment in ten minutes, and I might know beforehand that you were going to do it, and it would have just about as much effect upon me—oh, oh, well!—as the manner of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] when he is on his feet making a speech. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is another respect in which he resembles Sir John Falstaff. He has a bullying verbosity, or verbosity, whichever it may be, that does intimidate an ordinary, unaccustomed human being,

and long ago it would have intimidated me, too, before I got used to the noise, but I have been standing in the hearing of it for fifteen years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy, dressed in homemade clothes, made upon the plantation during the war out of wool off of our own sheep and cotton grown in our own field, spun and woven on our hand spindles and looms, when the war had just closed they were carrying me to Memphis to put me in school. I had never seen anything but a plantation and the things that grew upon a plantation—live stock and vegetables of various sorts. We finally got to a little town by the name of Grand Junction. I never knew why it was called "Grand," except, perhaps, that it was grand for that little particular place to be a junction at all. It was at that time populated by some 340 billy goats, some 4 saloons, and a few private residences. It also had one of those old-fashioned eating hotels where the railroad trains stopped for meals. You had to get off there in order to change cars for Memphis. While we were waiting the most unearthly noise I ever heard in all my life broke out upon my ears. Out in front of the piazza of the hotel the railroad tracks were running parallel and crisscrossing, the switch engines were going up and down, but I could not stand that noise behind me, and I made right out in front of the hotel. My old nurse Lucy took after me, caught me after a while amidst the railroad tracks and not far from some of the locomotives, and said, "My God, Mars Johnny, what is the matter with you?" I said, "Why, Lucy, didn't you hear that noise? Judgment day is coming. Everything is going to pieces." "Why," she said, "Mars Johnny, that ain't nothin' but a new-fangled dinner horn." I afterwards found out it was a Chinese gong. It was the first one I had ever gotten acquainted with, but not the last, whether mechanical or human.

Since that time I have never been intimidated by mere swell of breast or rotundity of sound nor by mere—oh, I do not like to say, because I know it is unconscious; it is not intended; I would not like to say insolence of manner. Shall I say, unconscious arrogation of superiority to common mortals? I would not like to say that either, because I think that even is unconscious, a mere oozing out at the pores, like Bob Acres's courage. I shall call it the absolute unpreventability of manner and voice of the gentleman from New York. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, you brought in a rule here, Mr. Chairman, and this rule reads that "the first reading of this bill shall be dispensed with; that after two hours' of general debate, the time to be equally divided," etc., a vote is to be taken. The other day you made an agreement in this House for eight hours upon this special bill. Now, by this rule you say two hours, not eight. The Chair very correctly ruled this morning. Of course the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] was merely trying to show the lack of moral conduct, the lack of ethics, on the Republican situation when he made the point of order. That you have the legal power, under a rule or without a rule, by a majority vote to break an agreement there is no doubt. You have the power to pass one thing in Congress one day and repeal it the next day, for that matter; but we have driven you to where you are not only changing your rules to suit your hand, but where you break your pledged word. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That you have the legal right to do it nobody doubts, nobody anywhere. But to repeal a law is one thing and to repeal an agreement amongst men is another thing. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

To take advantage of your power as lawmakers to get out of the attitude of an agreement between one another as men is a totally different thing. However, I do not want to dwell upon that; neither will you hereafter.

Now, a few words to this—the Democratic—side of the House and I shall conclude. We have not much power. The gentleman from New York has taken the trouble to tell us that this Congress would be run without any reference to us by that side of the Chamber. We have, however, some rights. One of them is a right inherent to each Member on this side to object to unanimous consent. It causes some inconvenience. Another is a right luckily secured by the Constitution itself and not destructible by the Committee on Rules, to call for the yeas and nays upon every affirmative proposition of legislation that passes through the House. Then we have some power in a different way. Whenever you dare—whenever you dare let the House consider any of these special bills to which I have referred, we have the power of adding ourselves as a minority to a fraction of the majority and thereby to make a majority of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have not very much hope that an opportunity will present itself to exercise that power and to show our utility to the country in that respect, because if there ever was anybody—and

I say it, as you all know, with all due regard and affection, for I have a feeling toward him almost like a son who has been kindly treated has toward his father or uncle—but if there ever was a man bestriding a situation of which he was afraid, and so much afraid that he fully deserved to be named after an Indian chief out in the West, "Old-Man-Afraid-of-His-Horses" [laughter on the Democratic side], that man is the present Speaker of this House at this moment. [Renewed laughter and applause.] There is nobody bestriding anything worse afraid of what he is bestriding at this time unless it be the Hon. SERENO PAYNE, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] Luckily for him, however—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for its attention, and shall sit down.

Mr. BURLESON. I can yield the gentleman further time.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. I will yield the gentleman part of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I have said is enough.

Mr. BURLESON. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, I propose to discuss one of the most important questions confronting the nation, to wit, that of transportation as affected by the proper improvement of our waterways. Every citizen is interested in cheap transportation because it enters into the daily life of everyone; it affects the food we eat, the clothes we put on, our movements from place to place. The more enlightened and civilized a nation, the more perfect its methods of transportation.

Waterways from the earliest days were the best means of transportation till the advent and development of railroads about eighty years ago, and they are still the cheapest of all known methods. Nearly 60,000,000 tons of freight were carried through the locks on the St. Marys River, connecting lakes Huron and Superior, last year at a freight charge of about .84 of 1 mill per ton per mile, which is about one-ninth of the average railroad rate of 7.48 mills per ton per mile, and water rates on the Ohio and lower Mississippi are about the same as on the Great Lakes. Had the total commerce of the Lakes last year, amounting to about 80,000,000 tons, been carried by rail at the average railroad rates of the entire Union the charges thereon would have exceeded by over \$300,000,000 the amounts actually paid for freight. Hence, the improvements on the Lakes, which have cost about \$70,000,000, saved last year to the American people more than four times as much as their total cost, and they will continue to save as much and more annually for all time to come.

*While actual statistics are not obtainable for all our waterways, I am convinced that water transportation costs only about one-sixth as much as the average cost by rail.*

Moreover, in many cases delivery by water is much quicker for heavy, bulky, low-class commodities. Railroad freight cars moved in 1906 an average of only 25 miles in twenty-four hours, and, I believe, an elaborate study would show that boats moved at least 100 miles in the same time.

Railroads are very limited in capacity, and there was fierce congestion on them not many months ago. On well-improved waters, such as Long Island Sound, the Great Lakes, and the Hudson and lower Mississippi Rivers, there is practically no limit to the volume of business that may be carried thereon and no danger of congestion.

Railroads are monopolistic corporations, owned, operated, and controlled for private gain. Competition over any given line is impossible, because the roadbed belongs to the corporation. Waterways are free roadbeds, for the use and enjoyment of all the people. Conditions for competition are perfect on them, and they can never be monopolized. No rate commission is needed to fix freight rates on improved water courses.

*Most of the great annual expenditures of our Government are like the rain falling on the parched sands of the desert, only to disappear and leave no trace behind. But waterway improvements are investments which will last forever. The eight millions expended in giving a 35-foot channel to Boston Harbor cheapens ocean rates fully 100 per cent to the grain grower of the West and the cotton producer of the South. The annual saving in freight rates exceeds the total cost of the project, and it will remain a lasting benefit to hundreds of generations of Americans for thousands of years after the Drednoughts of to-day have decayed into their original elements and been forgotten.*

The United States leads the world in many things. In railroads we are far ahead of any other country, but in waterway improvements we are way behind our Canadian neighbors and several European nations. No country on earth is better supplied by nature with waterways than ours, and though they have been sadly neglected in the past, I pray, in the words of Washington, uttered with prophetic wisdom one hundred and twenty years ago, "Would to God we may have the wisdom to improve them."

To sum up this branch of my subject, permit me to say that we should improve our waterways:

First. Because water transportation is much cheaper than by rail, and in many cases much quicker for the heavy, low-class commodities. On well-improved lakes and rivers the cost of transportation is about one-sixth of the average cost by rail.

Second. Because the railroads are congested and unable to handle the commerce of the country. Experts assert that during the past ten years production has increased 126 per cent and railroad facilities for handling it only 22 per cent. Improved waterways would relieve this congestion very materially, if not entirely, and would also furnish healthy competition with resultant cheapening of railroad rates.

Third. Because our commercial competitors—Germany and France—have so thoroughly developed and improved their waterways and cheapened freight charges that we will be unable to compete with them in the world's markets unless we do likewise.

Fourth. Because Canada now has a 14-foot canal connecting the Great Lakes with the ocean, and is planning a 21-foot canal through Georgian Bay and the Ottawa River, and we must make as good connections with the sea or the commercial supremacy of our great ports is liable to pass to a Canadian city.

Fifth. Because we are spending vast sums at Panama to connect two oceans by a canal 35 feet deep, and make the greatest artificial waterway on earth, and in order to reap its full benefits our rivers must be so improved as to get our commerce to the sea quickly at the lowest rates, and our harbors so deepened that any ship passing through that canal may enter any one of the important harbors on our seaboard.

Sixth. Because waterway improvements are as imperishable as the solid rock and concrete out of which they are constructed. They are permanent investments, returning to the nation every year and for all time a large dividend upon their cost.

Mr. Chairman, this question of waterway improvements has come very prominently before the American people within the past few years. It has been discussed perhaps as much as any other question. It is entirely a nonpolitical one, and I wish to say in advance that I do not intend to treat it along political lines. I wish to point out its importance as a business matter. I wish to suggest to this Congress some constructive business legislation which, in my judgment, sir, we should adopt at this time, and which we will make a serious mistake if we do not pass at this session.

On the 7th of last month I had the honor to introduce in this House a bill to create a new Executive Department, to be known as the "Department of Transportation and Public Works," and whose head shall be a member of the Cabinet. Lack of time prevents me from discussing this bill fully, but I will say, in brief, that it proposes to place under one Department all Federal matters relating in any way to transportation by highways, railways, and waterways, and to such public works of every kind and sort as require the intervention and services of skilled civilian engineers. It would include everything relating to public buildings and grounds, public roads, the Geological Survey, the Reclamation Service, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the surveys of public lands, a bureau of transportation, with important powers in regard to rail and water terminals and the administrative functions now exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a bureau of waterways, with all powers now delegated to the Engineer Corps of the Army, and many additional powers, and also bureaus of mining, of standards, and coordination.

You will observe that while the scope of the proposed Department is very broad, everything in it is closely allied, either because it relates to transportation or is a branch of the great science of civil engineering. I invite your careful consideration and criticism of this bill as a whole, but for the present must address myself to its waterway features.

The term "civilian engineer" is used in contrast with the engineers of the War Department, who now have charge of all Government works on the waterways of this country, and I wish to say that in my judgment we will never make a great success in improving these waterways until we take them entirely out of the hands of the war engineers. They are trained

for war, not for water, and we must have men thoroughly educated in hydraulics, or water engineering, rather than in the science of war, if we expect to get the best results.

Now, gentlemen, I have the highest regard and esteem for the splendid Engineer Corps of the Army. I do not believe there is a better branch of the public service than these engineers. I do not believe there is a branch which has rendered more faithful, more honorable, more honest, and more painstaking service than they have. I am not criticising them in the least, for they have done their best with the opportunities given them; but I am undertaking to criticise the American Congress, which has thrown upon these engineers the task of carrying on works of improvement on waterways under a most unbusinesslike and inadequate system, from which it was impossible to secure good results—indeed, under a nondescript method of nonaccomplishment, which is absolutely unworthy the name of system.

What is that method? Why, sirs, when any particular waterway is to be improved in any part of the country, its friends come to Congress and ask an order directing the Engineer Corps to make a survey of it. A bill is then passed commanding that it be done under carefully specified limitations, and under that order the engineers make the survey. If everything is favorable and the report satisfactory, Congress may adopt the project and appropriate part of the money necessary for it. The next, or some succeeding Congress, may fail to make appropriations, or some ambitious politician or engineer may bring about a change of plan, and the net result in most cases is interminable delay, with complete failure in many.

There has never yet been any well-defined, comprehensive plan or policy for the improvement of our waters as a whole. The engineers ordered, for instance, to survey the Ohio River with a view of obtaining 9 feet from Pittsburg to Cairo have no power whatsoever to investigate the mighty Missouri, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Arkansas, the Yazoo, the Ouachita, or any other of the various rivers of the great Mississippi system, all of which should form part of one comprehensive whole. Why, sirs, when a railroad car is loaded at my home in Lake Providence, La., it can go on a standard-gauge railroad to Boston, to Portland, to Chicago, or to any part of the Union. Now, if we require standards in railroads, we should have standards, or at least as near an approximation to standards as possible, in our waterways. But under our system the engineers have no right to make a general investigation, no right to work out a comprehensive plan, and no right to make recommendations in regard to anything except the one specific project submitted to them. They are mere automatons, mere machine surveyors, ordered by Congress to do thus and so, and their training at West Point as military men compels them to obey orders and do what they are told—no more and no less.

I should like to see a radical change in this matter. I should like to see the Department of Transportation and Public Works created, and in it a Bureau of Waterways, presided over by the greatest hydraulic engineer in the Union, to be called the "Commissioner of Waterways," aided and assisted by a number of high-class civilian engineers. I should like to see sufficient money given to this commissioner so that he might work out through the disconnected surveys already made and new surveys, and so forth, a broad, comprehensive, far-reaching plan for improving every waterway in the country along the seaboard, with its innumerable harbors and intercoastal waters, on the Great Lakes, and every river and connecting canal that is capable of being improved within reasonable cost and that seems to be justified by the present or prospective needs of commerce. [Applause.] When this plan is worked out it should be reported to Congress, and if adopted, in whole or in part, the execution should be committed to the commissioner and ample funds provided for the completion within the next ten years of all such projects as Congress approves.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I have been following the gentleman's speech closely, for I realize that no Member of the House has given more earnest and enthusiastic study to this great question than he has. I realize, too, that the delay in carrying on the river and harbor work has been very exasperating, in view of the existing demands of commerce. But it has seemed to me that the members of the Engineer Corps of the Army have done magnificent work and that the handicap has been, perhaps, from the fact that there has been such a small force. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that he could accomplish what he wants by a large increase in the engineer force?

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. I agree with your statement that our Army Engineer Corps have done magnificent work, and no man gives them higher credit than I, but I do not believe we can cure the disease by increasing their number. *The trouble goes deeper than that. We must go to the root of the system.* The United States Army engineers are not trained in hydraulics. The ten honor men of the graduating class at West Point, if I am correctly informed, are selected annually and placed in the Engineer Corps. These young engineers, fresh from college, after a brief sojourn in the Army, are then sent out to some work—for instance, on the Mississippi River, where they study the terrible flood, and the levees and caving banks of that great stream—and are kept there from one to three years. Thence they may go to the mouth of the Columbia, where the enormous waves of the Pacific, constantly pouring into that river and meeting its currents and shifting sands, present problems entirely different from those on the Mississippi. After one or two years on the Columbia, they are sent, perhaps, to your own great harbor at Boston, where the problems in rock dredging for the 35-foot channel secured by your efforts are very different from those on the Mississippi and the Columbia rivers. They work with the greatest diligence, as everyone does in Boston, and after two or three years are beginning to get a little understanding of their task when an order comes sending them to Chicago, Detroit, or Cleveland, where they are kept about the same time wrestling with the intricate and difficult problems of the Great Lakes. They then go to Savannah or New Orleans and build jetties to wash the sand off the bars at the mouths of the Mississippi and Savannah rivers under plans devised by the great civil engineer, James B. Eads. From there perchance they are sent to Yellowstone Park to build good roads in that grand playground of America. Then to the Philippines to construct railroads and military roads, at which they are busied for one or two years. Then back to San Francisco, where they build fortifications at the "Golden Gate." Then to Panama to make the great canal. And finally they are moved into active service with the Army, the real business for which they were educated and trained. And in not a single one of these positions, except the Army and fortification work, are they kept long enough to master the problems.

One of our ablest civilian engineers says that it would take the finest kind of an engineer fully fifteen or twenty years to master the problems on most any of our great rivers. I wish to say, after having lived on the banks of the Mississippi for twenty-six years, constantly studying it, and being somewhat of an embryo engineer myself, I do not believe there is a man living who can completely master all the problems of that great river in less than twenty years; and yet these gentlemen of the Army are expected to learn them in two or three years.

I repeat that we must get at the root of this system. If our main purpose in using Army engineers for works on waterways be to give them a broad, liberal education which will be of vast benefit in their military career, the present system is a *bonanza*, but if we seek the best interests of waterways and of commerce it is a *lemon*.

Replying further to your question, Mr. LAWRENCE: On the 28th of last month there were 175 members in the Engineer Corps, and the law authorizes a total of 188. Undoubtedly a large increase in the Corps would ultimately be of some help. They were distributed for duty as follows:

River and harbor, exclusively	24
River and harbor and other duties	36
Total river and harbor	60
Panama Canal	8
Insular possessions, including Cuba	28
Office Chief of Engineers	6
With troops in the United States	38
Light-House Establishment, exclusively	2
Public Buildings and Grounds, District of Columbia	2
District government	3
General Staff	1
Fortification work, exclusively	1
Survey of the Northern and Northwestern lakes	1
United States Military Academy	8
Army School of the Line, as instructors	2
In General Hospital	2
On leave of absence	4
On graduating leave of absence	9
Total	175

In my judgment, sirs, we should adopt the excellent plan followed by Germany and France. These wise nations have great schools where they train their engineers in hydraulics and other branches of civil engineering. All their public works of every kind relating to wharves, docks, waterways, canals, roads, railroads, and so forth, are placed in the hands of these skilled

civilians, who devote their whole lives to the task. Army engineers are not employed in civil works in either France or Germany. Nor do the Canadians use army engineers in improving their great waterways. And every student knows that these three countries are far ahead of the United States in the development and beneficial use of their waters.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Is not one of the difficulties this: That an engineer of the Army is assigned to a project and before it is completed he is removed and put in charge of some other work, another being assigned to this project, who frequently disagrees with the ideas of the engineer who preceded him?

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. Yes, that is literally true; and it sometimes results disastrously, nearly always produces great delay, and occasionally defeats the project.

To illustrate very briefly our unbusinesslike methods: We began to improve the Ohio River over twenty-five years ago so as to get a minimum low-water depth of 6 feet from Pittsburgh to Cairo. Nineteen engineers of the corps have expended the sums which Congress doled out in the triennial river and harbor bills, and after the lapse of a quarter of a century of effort less than one-tenth of the work is finished. A recent survey of the river recommends 9 feet instead of 6, and the additional cost is estimated at \$63,000,000. If old methods are followed, this 9-foot scheme will be on the boards for over a hundred years. *A complete and radical change is necessary.* Before leaving this topic, I wish to say, in justice to the engineers, that the fault on the Ohio lies entirely with Congress and its parsimonious appropriations—not with the engineers, who spent all that was given them.

Some of my Democratic colleagues have objected to my bill, because, as they say, we have too many executive departments now. It is well for us to look around and see what the balance of the world is doing in this respect. If there be real need for a Department of Transportation and Public Works, and if we can find strong precedent for it in other advanced countries, certainly there is no reason why we should not have it. [Applause.] Especially is that true if we find abroad more members in these departments than nine, which is the number in our Cabinet. In Great Britain there are nineteen members of the cabinet; in Canada, eleven, one of whom is the minister of public works; in Argentine Republic, eight, one of whom is minister of public works; in France, a Republic just like ours, eleven, one of whom is minister of public works; in Japan, nine, one of whom is minister of communications; in Mexico, eight, one of whom is minister of communications and public works; in the Netherlands, nine, one of whom is minister of public works; and in Russia, fourteen, one of whom is minister of ways and communications, so there is plenty of precedent for us. If we wish to add a member to our Cabinet we can find precedent both for the increase and for the creation of a Department of Public Works.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this matter of improving our waterways has been called to the attention of the country most persistently during the last two or three years, and no man has done it more forcefully and intelligently than the President of the United States. In three messages to this Congress he has called particular attention to the necessity of adopting a waterway policy at this session, *the necessity of changing our policy now. Just as he wants other legislation now, he wants waterway legislation now.* Let me read a few of his utterances.

In his annual message on December 3 last, Mr. Roosevelt said:

Our great river systems should be developed as national water highways. The National Government should undertake this work, and I hope a beginning will be made in the present Congress. The work should be systematically and continuously carried forward in accordance with some well-conceived plan.

Those words have a familiar sound. The national Democratic platform of 1904 contained the first strong declaration in favor of waterway improvements ever adopted by a national party. It reads:

We favor liberal appropriations for the care and improvement of the waterways of the country. When any waterway like the Mississippi River is of sufficient importance to demand special aid of the Government, such aid should be extended with a definite plan of continuous work until permanent improvement is secured.

Now, Mr. Chairman, do not you think the President must have had before him when he penned his December message that wellspring of patriotic wisdom and statesmanship—the national Democratic platform of 1904? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I think so, because the words and ideas are so similar.

On February 26 last, when transmitting to Congress the preliminary report of the Inland Waterways Commission, the President said:

Our people are united in support of the immediate adoption of a progressive policy of inland waterway development. Hitherto the national policy of inland waterway development has been largely negative. No single agency has been responsible under Congress for making the best use of our rivers or for enforcing foresight in their development.

My friends, let me emphasize that proposition. No single agency has ever been responsible for our waterways. They have been in all of our history a mere incident, a side issue with one bureau—the Engineer Corps of the War Department—a Department which has nothing in common with waterways, only a side issue, with one bureau, in a Department which pays no attention whatsoever to commerce instead of being the main issue in one devoted to transportation and civil works.

Mr. BEDE. And do not have half of that bureau?

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. And not half of that bureau. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion; only a small part of the engineer bureau.

The President continues:

Frequent changes of plan and piecemeal execution of projects have still further hampered improvements.

Just as my friend Mr. HUMPHREYS suggested.

The first condition of successful development of our waterways is a definite and progressive policy. The second is a concrete general plan, prepared by the best experts available, covering every use to which our streams can be put. We shall not succeed until the responsibility for administering the policy and executing and extending the plans is definitely laid on one man or group of men who can be held accountable.

That is what my bill proposes to do; to place this power in the hand of one man and one group of men, who can be held accountable.

Adequate funds should be provided, by bond issue, if necessary, and the work should be delayed no longer. The development of our waterways and the conservation of our forests are the two most pressing physical needs of the country. They are interdependent, and they should be met vigorously, together and at once.

These are strong, wise words. Would to heaven Congress would hearken to them at once!

Only a few days ago, in a special message sent us on the 25th day of March, he says:

Amples provision should be made for a permanent waterways commission, with whatever power is required to make it effective. The reasonable expectation of the people will not be met unless the Congress provides at this session for the beginning and prosecution of the actual work of waterway improvement and control.

Now, in line with that last message, gentlemen of the committee, permit me to say that I heartily favor the creation of an Inland Waterways Commission as suggested by the President, but I do not favor giving them any power at this time except that of investigation and recommendation, so that they may advise Congress in regard to the best methods of handling this troublesome question. I think this Commission should visit the old countries of the earth and such parts of North and South America as have taken advanced stands in water improvements. I think they should get the benefit of all the world's lore in regard to this most important business matter, and after a thorough, painstaking investigation they should transmit their findings and recommendations to Congress. With the assistance and advice of this commission of scientists and experts Congress could determine upon a "definite and progressive policy" to be executed under "a concrete general plan," and when that is done, the Department I propose, through its Waterway Bureau, could carry out our statutes on the subject. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, on the 4th, 5th, and 6th of last December a great waterways convention was held in this city by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Nearly 2,000 delegates were accredited to it, and there were representatives from thirty-seven States of this Union. That convention voiced the opinion of the American people when it declared in favor of a "wise, liberal, and comprehensive waterway policy that will provide for the proper improvement within the next ten years of the rivers, waterways, and harbors of our country the improvement of which is justified by the present and prospective benefits to commerce;" when it asked Congress to view river and harbor appropriations as "an investment in permanent improvements bound to pay increasing dividends from year to year;" when it urged annual appropriations of "not less than \$50,000,000" for waterways, and promised its support to a "bond issue, similar in character to that for building the Panama Canal, if same be found necessary." [Loud applause.] It gave expression to the idea dominant in the business world of America that water transportation is essential to our commercial prosperity and that it should be developed to the utmost without delay.

The proceedings of this convention met with unanimous approval from the press in every part of the country, and no dissenting voice has been heard. The brief time allowed me permits only a few short quotations, though I have editorial indorsement from over a hundred leading papers.

In the Evening Star, of this city, an editorial in its issue of December 5, 1907, while the convention was in session, says:

The present movement, which is both nonsectional and nonpartisan—national in the truest sense—deserves success. It is in accord with what may be characterized as a general awakening to great national needs, hitherto but imperfectly appraised or else entirely neglected. Our waterways are an asset of incalculable value, and by the proper care may be made to solve many difficulties in the problem of transportation, and every member of either House of Congress can well afford to give his voice and vote for a comprehensive policy of permanent improvement.

It is not a matter of a few years or a few millions. A study of the map shows both the extent and the importance of the undertaking. The larger rivers are long, the smaller crooked. All will call for a liberal outlay if what is in view is to be accomplished. For this reason the greatest importance attaches, as Mr. Root points out, to what is now on the cards. A beginning means a carrying forward of work, and money will be wasted if the beginning is not wisely made. As the Secretary puts it, a policy, not a project, confronts us.

In the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 6, I find:

There must be a fixed plan. There must be a definite sum set aside not spasmodically, but annually.

Fifty millions a year for the next ten years—this is one of the objects aimed at by the great conference of delegates at Washington.

A regular plan and fifty millions a year as a positive fixture—that is a policy which Congress must adopt if it is to consider, first of all, the vital interests of the country.

The Times-Democrat, of New Orleans, La., on December 7, speaks as follows:

Will Congress declare for a definite waterway improvement policy, backing up its declaration of faith with adequate monetary support, or will it refuse the request in which practically the entire nation has joined?

No great public movement was ever more strongly backed by national sentiment. The waterways propaganda has progressed steadily for years. Half measures and patchwork policies have been found expensive and profitless. The belief in the absolute necessity of comprehensive and systematic improvement has been forced upon us by natural and commercial conditions. Even in the ranks of the obstructionists there is hardly a man who will not admit the national need of enlarged waterways. In the demand put forward by the Rivers and Harbors Congress there is neither politics nor sectionalism. Prominent Democrats and leading Republicans are united in its support. Resistance to the movement can not be justified upon grounds of political expediency, and even less by the plea of economy, for the improved waterways system will of itself work economies upon the grand scale. Congress can not dodge the issue. It must give a direct answer to the appeal, and its speech must be "yea, yea," or "nay, nay."

On December 8 the Chicago Inter-Ocean gave its indorsement:

The Rivers and Harbors Convention, the largest and most representative gathering ever held to discuss the subject, at its meeting in Washington last week requested Congress to make a standing or permanent appropriation of \$50,000,000 a year for the improvement of the nation's waterways.

The nation's growth has compelled the taking of new thought about the rivers. The nation's production and trade have outgrown railway capacity. Money might be found to build more railways, but it is being seen ever more clearly that the railways can never adequately take the place of the waterway.

No wit of man can make the car as cheap a carrier as the boat. Where rapid transit is not essential, as with the vast bulk of freight it is not, the waterway is superior.

In the News, of Cleveland, Ohio, on January 6 are these strong words:

Waterways cheapen transportation by both water and rail. Cheap transportation is as essential to industry as it is to successful agriculture. There is not one square mile of territory in America whose interests can be absolutely divorced from the waterways problem. The country has, in the Great Lakes, the Mississippi, and other great water courses, the making of the finest system of internal waterways in the world. The future of the country requires that the work go forward.

Let Congress feel that the people demand it.

And in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 20 is this stinging rebuke to our inaction:

A few cheese-parers and pullbacks in Washington, assuming to be leaders, are possessed with the idea that it is good politics to hold up every possible improvement and thus make a showing of economy. It is a miserly and altogether detestable trick which will not fool anyone. The people are ready to indorse the development of waterways and they look to Congress to start the ball a-rolling.

We believe with Senator Knox that there is nothing before the country of greater importance than the opening up of these new transportation routes. They mean cheaper rates for all of the people.

But Congress loiters and hesitates. Why?

There is not a single Member from any State in the Union who can give a satisfactory answer.

In addition to the President's messages, the actions of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and many similar waterway conventions, the universal demand of the commercial world, even including railroads, and the united press, we have all the candidates for President clamoring for waterway improvements. Mr. Knox delivered a speech at Pittsburg recently which is one of the most notable contributions to this subject. Mr. Taft's Ohio platform, adopted March 4, has a very strong waterway plank, and so has the platform of Mr. Bryan at Omaha,

March 6. Governor Johnson was one of the star speakers at the Rivers and Harbors Congress. "Uncle Joe" and Mr. FAIRBANKS expressed hearty approval of that convention's resolutions. Mr. Hughes is also a believer. I have not heard from FORAKER and LA FOLLETTE, but have no doubt they are both on the waterway wagon. And there is not a single Member of Congress who dares or wishes to raise his voice in opposition.

What, then, is the trouble, and why do we delay? Do not fool yourselves into believing the country will excuse you because of a probable deficit in the Treasury. It does not require much cash to inaugurate great engineering works, as they progress very slowly, but you should authorize them and let the good work begin; then, if funds are not available in the future, as the work proceeds, bonds may be issued, as in the Panama Canal. I am no advocate of bonds if we can get along without them, but I cheerfully voted authority to the President to issue bonds for the Panama Canal when necessary, and being convinced that the improvement of our internal waterways would benefit us much more than that canal ever will, I will vote bonds for waterways if they can be improved in no other way.

Do not be misled, either, by the statement that there are large unexpended sums on hand for our waterways out of past appropriations and we need no more till those amounts are expended. It is true that most of the money appropriated and authorized in our bill of last year is still unspent, because it takes a long time in many instances to get ready, as, for example, the new lock at Sault Ste. Marie and the new channel on the Detroit River, for which we gave some thirteen millions in the last bill. But it is certain that work can not begin until the project is adopted and authorized by Congress.

Some most meritorious and expensive projects are now ready for Congressional action which were not in shape last year, as, for example, the Ohio River, which will cost over \$63,000,000. The report on this project was submitted to Congress on the 13th of last February, and it is very strongly urged by all the engineers connected with it. That gigantic project, which is of interest to the entire country, should be delayed no longer, but it should be adopted at this session and work begun at once. At least six and a half millions should be appropriated or authorized for it now, and Congress should commit itself definitely to a similar sum every year until it is completed. We hope to complete the Panama Canal in ten years from its beginning; surely the Ohio River, if worthy of improvement, as all admit, should not require more time for competition than that great canal.

I use the Ohio merely as an illustration. There are many other waters of great merit, including that grand conception which has the hearty indorsement of the President—a 14-foot channel from the Lakes to the Gulf, on which appropriations could be most wisely made at this session.

Moreover, there are some prospective projects of the first magnitude, such as the Atlantic coast inland waterway from Boston to Florida, on which nothing can be done until surveys and estimates are made. Our friends along the coast will be deeply disappointed if we do not pass a bill and give them the desired survey. Such a survey will take much time—probably two or more years. If we have no bill till next year, and then order a survey, it will probably be three years from now before their claims can be presented for action by Congress. This is an unreasonable and unwise delay. I know nothing of the merits of this proposed intercoastal canal except in the most general way, but if it is half as good as its friends claim it to be, we ought to be in position to act on it as soon as possible.

By all means let us have river and harbor legislation at this session. I beg of you to consider the gravity of this situation, and implore you not to let the session pass without legislation looking to a broad, comprehensive plan for improving all of our waterways.

Mr. Chairman and gentleman, permit me to suggest that this question is up to you, and you must solve it or be held accountable. Like Banquo's ghost, it will not down, but must be settled, or at least placed in the process of adjustment at this session of Congress. You can not delay it or dodge it. You must say "yea, yea," or "nay, nay!" [Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. How much time remains on the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. No time remains on the other side, and ten minutes remain to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BANNON].

Mr. BANNON. Mr. Chairman, the leading article in The Saturday Evening Post of March 21 is entitled "The Undiscussed Issue." The article purports to discuss the protective tariff.

The author of it is Will Payne, but he certainly is not a regular subscriber to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or he would not have indulged in such a misnomer. It is possibly needless to say that he has no connection with the Committee on Ways and Means or its distinguished chairman. The Saturday Evening Post is a great journal. Its circulation must be enormous. You meet it everywhere. You find it at every railway station, on all trains, in every hotel, in every village. It goes to the homes of the people. Its contributors are interesting writers, and it occupies a position in this country as a publication which gives standing and character to its utterances. For this very reason any statement of fact made by it from which conclusions are drawn should be most accurate. Otherwise, the reader is misled. In the article I just referred to are many glaring inaccuracies, to which attention should be drawn, lest they be accepted as facts. I will read a paragraph from that article:

Massachusetts leads the United States in production of manufactured goods per capita. There is a protective duty of 25 per cent on boots; but there is another of 20 per cent on sole leather and 15 per cent on hides—the raw materials. There is a leather trust which is an adjunct of the beef trust, and somebody complains that the hide duty puts \$1 into the United States Treasury and \$4 into the fat coffers of the beef trust.

Massachusetts manufacturers have a machine with which one man sews 250 pairs of shoes in a day; another which enables a single operative, at one stage, to handle 300 pairs daily, against 5 pairs by hand. Some of the manufacturers have concluded, therefore, that with free hides they would take their chances against the pauper labor of Europe. They might then get a chance at the export trade which they are now completely shut out of. Of all manufactures of leather we export \$50,000 worth a year; of leather itself and all its manufactures about a hundred thousand dollars' worth, while of leather and its manufactures we import from fifteen to twenty million dollars' worth a year, all paying duty. Last year our imports of hides (duti-able) rose to 135,000,000 pounds. The domestic producer of leather, having erected the tariff fence, can not meet the demand.

The shoe manufacturer, paying 15 per cent duty on hides and 20 per cent on sole leather, has an additional protection for his finished product of only 5 or 10 per cent.

The first statement is that because American shoe manufacturers are operating some wonderful machinery designed to lessen the cost of production some of them are willing to take their chances against the pauper labor of Europe if Congress will repeal the duty on hides. The author, inferentially at least, admits that there is pauper labor in Europe. But why can not this pauper labor operate the same machinery? And if that is done, why will our workmen not still be in competition with them? The foreign manufacturer can get the same machinery Americans use. No trouble about that. The shoe manufacturers have had the proposition put up to them time and again to say whether they desired the admission to our markets, free of duty, of foreign-made boots and shoes, but they have never said they did, and they will not say it in our time.

The article states that with free hides our shoe manufacturers would get a chance at an export trade which they are now completely shut out of. This can not be true. The author states that we export only about \$50,000 worth of manufactures of leather a year. He misses it by a little matter of more than eleven and a quarter million of dollars. Instead of exporting \$50,000 worth a year, we exported, in 1903, \$11,326,011 worth of the manufactures of leather. This article states that of leather itself and all its manufactures we export only about a hundred thousand dollars' worth annually. He misses that by more than \$45,000,000. We exported last year leather and manufactures of leather to the value of \$45,476,969. Mr. Payne's premises being wrong, how can his conclusions be right? When I read his figures I knew he must have found them somewhere, so I made a search, and I believe I know where he got them. He took them from the tables showing the summary of exports of foreign merchandise. He should have consulted the tables showing the exports of domestic merchandise. His figures represent the values of the merchandise named by him which were manufactured, not in America, but abroad, imported to our country, and then exported—reexports they are commonly called. The figures I give you are the exports of domestic manufactures, which were, of course, made in this country by our labor and our factories. This merely illustrates the danger of accepting too hasty an examination of statistics.

Again, Mr. Payne tells us in The Saturday Evening Post that of leather and its manufactures we import from fifteen to twenty million dollars' worth a year. While we did import last year more than \$20,000,000 worth, yet if he will take a period of the last ten years he will find the average nearer eleven millions. He also tells us that 135,000,000 pounds of hides (duti-able) were imported last year. This is true; but we exported more than 15,000,000 pounds.

Mr. Payne refers to sole leather and hides as the raw material out of which shoes are made. Again he is in error.

Sole leather is made out of hides, so they are really the same thing. The uppers of shoes are made from horse hides, goat, sheep, kangaroo, and calf skins, all of which are now admitted free of duty and constitute in value three-fourths of our importation of hides.

In this article the author deduces the conclusion that because there is a protective duty of 25 per cent on shoes and a 15 per cent duty on the hides and a 20 per cent duty on the sole leather which enter into the manufacture of shoes that consequently the manufacturer has a protection of but 5 or 10 per cent. In this he is mistaken. The material out of which leather for the uppers of most of the shoes worn in this country is made is admitted free of duty. In almost every shoe that is worn the only portions bearing any duty levied on hides are the soles and heels. Very few shoes are made out of cattle hides, and those that are are worn by the farmers, and they get the benefit of the duty on hides. The duty in the soles and heels is less than 2 cents per pair; so, consequently, it is absurd to presume that hides and sole leather are the only raw materials used and that the duty levied on them reduces the protection given shoes.

I direct the attention of the House to this matter to show you how misleading some of the articles are which appear in our magazines. It is no wonder the public is often given wrong impressions. In many cases, as in this one, the errors are not intentional, but are made through a lack of intimate knowledge of the subjects. Many of these agitations hurt legitimate business. The tariff affects this entire country and every citizen in it. Consequently, in the discussions that are bound to come this fall great care should be exercised to be sure of the grounds upon which you base your conclusions.

The next Republican national convention will, in all probability, declare for tariff revision. To secure a Republican revision the next House of Representatives must be Republican. The effect upon American industries of tariff revision by the Democratic party is illustrated by its position on the duties on cattle hides and on manufactures from leather.

Republican revision means that the difference in wages paid here and abroad shall enter into the settlement of the schedules. Democratic revision would give this difference no consideration. Republican revision means that the American wage-earners' mode of living shall be compared with that of the workmen of foreign lands. Democratic revision pays no heed to that. Republican revision will protect both the high wages and the better mode of living so generally enjoyed in this country. Democratic revision will protect neither. One of the great issues in November, then, will be whether or not Americans want such a revision as will give us a protective tariff or a tariff for revenue only; a revision by protectionists or by free traders; a revision by the friends of protection or by its enemies; a revision by the Republican party or by the Democratic party. That will be the great issue for the American electorate to decide. The history of our country and the experience of our people leave no room to doubt what the result will be. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20063, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same.

H. R. 19955. An act making appropriations to supply certain additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. ADAIR, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of James B. Mulford, H. R. 13108, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I rise for the purpose of asking a division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 170, noes 41.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 88, nays 82, answered "present" 16, not voting 202, as follows:

## YEAS—88.

Allen	Dawson	Hill, Conn.	Mann
Ames	Denby	Holliday	Morse
Bannon	Diekema	Howell, N. J.	Mouser
Bartholdt	Douglas	Howell, Utah	Mudd
Bede	Draper	Hubbard, Iowa	Murdock
Birdsall	Driscoll	Hubbard, W. Va.	Needham
Bonyng	Dwight	Jones, Wash.	Nye
Brownlow	Ellis, Mo.	Kahn	Payne
Burke	Englebright	Kelfer	Pray
Burleigh	Focht	Kimball	Reynolds
Rutler	Fowler	Kinkaid	Roberts
Campbell	Fuller	Knowland	Rodenberg
Capron	Gaines, W. Va.	Küstermann	Smith, Iowa
Cary	Gardner, Mich.	Lafean	Snapp
Caulfield	Gardner, N. J.	Laning	Southwick
Chapman	Haggott	Lindbergh	Stafford
Conner	Hale	Lowden	Sullivan
Cook, Colo.	Hamilton, Mich.	McCreary	Taylor, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.	Haskins	McGuire	Volstead
Cushman	Hawley	McKinley, Ill.	Vreeland
Dalzell	Higgins	McKinney	Weeks
Davidson		McLachlan, Cal.	Young

## NAYS—82.

Adair	Cravens	Houston	Pou
Aiken	Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Randsell, La.
Alexander, Mo.	Favrot	Hull, Tenn.	Rauch
Bartlett, Ga.	Fitzgerald	Humphreys, Miss.	Richardson
Bartlett, Nev.	Floyd	James, Ollie M.	Robinson
Beall, Tex.	Foster, Ill.	Kelher	Rothermel
Beil, Ga.	Gaines, Tenn.	Kitchin, Claude	Rucker
Bocher	Garner	Lamar, Mo.	Russell, Mo.
Bowers	Gillespie	Leake	Sheppard
Brodhead	Gregg	Lewis	Sherley
Broussard	Hackett	Lloyd	Sherwood
Burleson	Hackney	McHenry	Slayden
Burnett	Hamlin	Macon	Stanley
Byrd	Hardwick	Moon, Tenn.	Stephens, Tex.
Caldwell	Hardy	Moore, Tex.	Thomas, N. C.
Carlin	Harrison	Murphy	Tou Velle
Carter	Hay	Nicholls	Watkins
Clark, Mo.	Hefflin	O'Connell	Wiley
Clayton	Helm	Padgett	Williams
Cooper, Tex.	Henry, Tex.	Page	
Cox, Ind.	Hill, Miss.	Peters	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—16.

Adamson	Garrett	Johnson, S. C.	Slemp
Bennet, N. Y.	Goulden	McGavin	Smith, Cal.
Dixon	Howland	Rainey	Smith, Mich.
Ferris	Jenkins	Shackelford	Wanger

## NOT VOTING—202.

Acheson	Fairchild	Knapp	Powers
Alexander, N. Y.	Fassett	Knopf	Pratt
Andrus	Finley	Lamar, Fla.	Prince
Ansberry	Flood	Lamb	Pujo
Anthony	Fordney	Landis	Randell, Tex.
Ashbrook	Fornes	Langley	Reeder
Barchfield	Foss	Lassiter	Reld
Barclay	Foster, Ind.	Law	Rhinock
Bates	Foster, Vt.	Lawrence	Riordan
Beale, Pa.	Foulkrod	Lee	Russell, Tex.
Bennett, Ky.	French	Legare	Ryan
Bingham	Fulton	Lenahan	Sabath
Boutell	Gardner, Mass.	Lever	Saunders
Boyd	Gilhams	Lilley	Scott
Bradley	Gill	Lindsay	Sherman
Brantley	Gillett	Littlefield	Sims
Brick	Glass	Livingston	Small
Brumm	Godwin	Longworth	Smith, Mo.
Brundidge	Goebel	Lorimer	Smith, Tex.
Burgess	Goldfogle	Loud	Sparkman
Burton, Del.	Gordon	Loudenslager	Sperry
Burton, Ohio	Graft	Lovering	Splight
Calder	Graham	McCall	Steenerson
Calderhead	Granger	McDermott	Sterling
Candler	Griggs	McKinlay, Cal.	Stevens, Minn.
Chaney	Gronna	McLain	Sturgiss
Clark, Fla.	Hall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sulzer
Cockran	Hamill	McMillan	Talbot
Cocks, N. Y.	Hamilton, Iowa	McMorran	Tawney
Cole	Hammond	Madden	Taylor, Ala.
Cook, Pa.	Harding	Madison	Thistlewood
Cooper, Pa.	Haugen	Malby	Thomas, Ohio
Coudrey	Hayes	Marshall	Tirrell
Cousins	Henry, Conn.	Maynard	Townsend
Craig	Hepburn	Miller	Underwood
Crawford	Hinshaw	Mondell	Waldo
Crumpacker	Hitchcock	Moon, Pa.	Wallace
Currier	Hobson	Moore, Pa.	Washburn
Darragh	Howard	Nelson	Watson
Davenport	Huff	Norris	Webb
Davey, La.	Hughes, W. Va.	Olcott	Weems
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Olmsted	Weisse
Dawes	Humphrey, Wash.	Overstreet	Wheeler
De Armond	Jackson	Parker, N. J.	Willett
Dunwell	James, Addison D.	Parker, S. Dak.	Wilson, Ill.
Durey	Johnson, Ky.	Parsons	Wilson, Pa.
Edwards, Ga.	Jones, Va.	Patterson	Wolf
Edwards, Ky.	Kennedy, Iowa	Pearre	Wood
Ellerby	Kennedy, Ohio	Perkins	Woodyard
Ellis, Oreg.	Kipp	Pollard	
Esch	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Porter	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For this session:

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Until further notice:

Mr. HALL with Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa.

Until Monday:

Mr. BURTON of Ohio with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.

For the balance of this day:

Mr. GILLET with Mr. LEGARE.

Mr. FOULKROD with Mr. HAMIL.

Mr. NELSON with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. MILLER with Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. RAINEX.

For this vote:

Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. WALDO with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. CRAWFORD.

Mr. BEALE of Pennsylvania with Mr. BURGESS.

Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. DE ARMOND.

Mr. DUREY with Mr. GILL.

Mr. ESCH with Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. HAMMOND.

Mr. LAW with Mr. HITCHCOCK.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. HOBSON.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. McALL with Mr. LAMB.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. McMORRAN with Mr. LEE.

Mr. MALBY with Mr. McLAIN.

Mr. MARSHALL with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. PARKER of South Dakota with Mr. REID.

Mr. PARSONS with Mr. RUSSELL of Texas.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. CRAIG.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for installation of machinery in Augusta, Ga., arsenal—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for construction at regimental post at Bagnio, P. I.—to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for repair of the water power at Rock Island Arsenal—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for maintenance of anchorage buoys in the port of New York—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a recommendation in relation to repairs on the U. S. S. *Maine*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of R. B. Bottom, executor of estate of Henry P. Bottom, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the rifle range at Fort Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6131) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Rock River, State of Illinois, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1380), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16066) providing for the payment of an annual license tax by dealers in all forms of manufactured tobacco in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1381), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1086) to correct military record of Pleasant Thomas, late of Company B, East Tennessee National Guards, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1377), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WALDO, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14290) for the relief of Ellis W. Joy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1378), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BATES, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3125) for the relief of Jabez Burchard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1379), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12390) granting a pension to Martin V. Stanton, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 20307) authorizing the use of 14-ounce internal-revenue stamps for manufactured snuff and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 20308) to establish a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 20309) appropriating \$1,500 for paving Walnut street and alley adjoining the Federal building at Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 20310) relating to the liability of common carriers by railroads to their employees in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 20311) to amend an act entitled "An Act to provide for refunding taxes paid upon legacies and bequests for uses of a religious, charitable, or educational character, for the encouragement of art, and so forth, under the act of June 13, 1898, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1902—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20312) to create a Bureau of Harbors and Waterways under the Department of Commerce and Labor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 20313) making drunkenness in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor and to provide a hospital for inebriates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 20314) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the purchase

of a lot of land on Hampton Roads, Virginia, and the buildings, structures, piers, and improvements thereon for the use of the Navy Department of the United States as a naval training station and a coaling station, and for other governmental purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 162) authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to test appliances intended to promote the safety of railway operation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 36) permitting the use of the United States Capitol building by the International Congress on Tuberculosis—to the Select Committee on House Rooms.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution (H. Res. 323) amending rules of the House—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 324) for the consideration of H. R. 19955—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 325) providing rule for consideration of District of Columbia appropriation bill—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPERRY: Memorial of the legislature of Connecticut relating to the Platt National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 20315) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOYD: A bill (H. R. 20316) granting an increase of pension to Michael Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20317) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel M. Holaday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 20318) for the relief of the estate of John Souder, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20319) for the relief of the estate of John R. Colvin, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20320) for the relief of Mrs. Ella V. Gordon, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20321) for the relief of Nancy Tynan, Christopher Rotchford, and John J. Rotchford, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20322) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Tappmeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 20323) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 20324) granting an increase of pension to Lottie M. Raynes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20325) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 20326) granting a pension to Eliza A. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 20327) for the relief of Mrs. Salome Myers Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20328) for the relief of the legal representatives of Peter Myers, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 20329) granting an increase of pension to George W. Huddleston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 20330) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Burk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 20331) granting a pension to Mary Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20332) granting a pension to George H. Pretty—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20333) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Hardwick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20334) for the relief of the heirs of William W. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20335) for the relief of the heirs of John G. Freeman, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 20336) for the relief of Priestley E. Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20337) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 20338) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20339) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 20340) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 20341) granting an increase of pension to Francis R. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 20342) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Moreau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 20343) granting an increase of pension to John A. Grubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 20344) granting an increase of pension to John Van Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, for legislation to secure a practical census of the timber of the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Louisa St. Clair Crall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of American Dramatist Club, for enactment of the Kittredge copyright bill (S. 2900)—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of North American Fish and Game Protective Association, for legislation in the interest of international control of boundary lakes and rivers between Canada and the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Knights of St. Casimer Society, of Erie, Pa., against further restrictive measures touching immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of California Harbor, No. 15, American Association of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, of San Francisco, Cal., for H. R. 14941, amending section 4463 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring reference of currency reform to a currency commission composed of Members of Congress, bankers, and others of experience—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of National Bank of Erie, Pa., favoring the Dalzell bill (H. R. 6091), to amend national banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Credit Men's Association and Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition from the governor, State officers, and many other prominent citizens of the State of Colorado, for legislation to provide for an increased coinage of silver and for the remonetization of silver upon a fair and reasonable ratio to gold—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of Business Men's League of St. Joseph, Mo., favoring H. R. 14934 and S. 4914, to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Wawayanda Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring a national highways commission (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of China, Me., for a national highways commission and for Federal aid in road construction—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of A. S. Gay, for national highways commission and Federal aid in construction of public highways (H. R. 11837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of board of directors of the Merchants' Association of New York, against all legislation to modify existing laws relative to injunctions or restraining orders involving relations of employer and employee—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Jennie Bennett and Dennis Desmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Albert Firmin, of the Allied Board of Trade, approving bill for widening Wallabout channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Butler Builders' Exchange, of Butler, Pa., against the passage of H. R. 15651 (the eight-hour bill)—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Petitions of H. M. Hemstreet and 9 other residents of Bellaire, Antrim County; Lavern Winright and 6 other members of Greenwood Grange, No. 1217, of Morley, Mecosta County; F. L. De Lamater and 30 other residents of Roscommon County; Thomas Guyer and 7 other residents of Central Lake, Antrim County; and Wilson Grange, No. 719, of East Jordan, Charlevoix County, all in the State of Michigan, for the creation of a national highways commission and appropriation for Federal aid in construction and improvement of public highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of H. H. McDowell, of Pontiac, Ill., for H. R. 19250, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of A. Krizyzanski and others, of Union City, Conn., against the treatment of Polish citizens of Prussia by the Prussian Diet—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Rev. F. M. Bronic and other citizens of Farragut, Iowa, praying for legislation giving States control over importation of intoxicating liquors (H. R. 4776)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John L. Bashor Post, No. 122, Grand Army of the Republic, of Centerville, Iowa, against legislation abolishing pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of R. E. Drew and others, for national highways commission and Federal aid in construction of public roads (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: Petition of residents of Fish Creek, Wis., against H. R. 4897, to enforce Sunday observance as day of rest in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAW: Petition of Young Friends Lodge, No. 147, I. O. B. A., against restrictive legislation now pending in Congress touching immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petitions of East Hebron Grange, of Hebron, Me., and Norland Grange, of East Limerick, Me., for a national highways commission and Federal aid in road construction (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of E. P. Vrycholt and others, of Hillman, Mich., for a national highways commission and for Federal aid in construction of public highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN: Petition of Pine Plains (N. Y.) Grange, No. 803, favoring a national highways commission and appropriation for Federal aid in construction of public highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of young men of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Geneva, N. Y., for enactment of the Littlefield original-package bill (H. R. 4776)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of New England Hardware Dealers' Association, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains (H. R. 10456 and 10457)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Micaiah Lamb—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petitions in favor of H. R. 7625, known as the "Sherwood bill," to authorize the enactment of a veteran volunteer roll, at the rate of \$1 per day, as follows:

New Washington, Ind., 14 veterans;

Post-office address not given, 155 veterans;

Arnica, Cedar County, Mo., 54 veterans;

Wesley L. Jones's district, Washington, 40 veterans;

Denver, Colo., two, of 80 veterans each;

Danville, Shelby County, Ill., 33 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 66 veterans;  
 Park Falls, N. Y., 60 veterans;  
 Jasper, Mo., 50 veterans;  
 Warren County, 60 veterans;  
 Loudon County, Ky., 20 veterans;  
 Miami, Okla., 60 veterans;  
 Spring Hill, Kans., 30 veterans;  
 Ogden Post, No. 569, Nova, 12 veterans;  
 Cape Girardeau, Mo., 115 veterans;  
 Indiana, 58 veterans;  
 Lowell, Mass., 60 veterans;  
 Virginia, Ill., 44 veterans;  
 Fredericksburg, Ill., 47 veterans;  
 Troy, Ohio, 99 veterans;  
 Ruckneyville, Ill., 200 veterans;  
 De Graff, Ill., 24 veterans;  
 Tedrow, Ohio, 24 veterans;  
 Claremore, Okla., 50 veterans;  
 Blenker Veterans' Association, of New York, 60 veterans;  
 Crestline, Ohio, 70 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 124 veterans;  
 Williams County, Ohio, 191 veterans;  
 Dykes, Mo., 15 veterans;  
 Zanesville, Ohio;  
 Monte Vista, Colo., 20 veterans;  
 Columbus, Ohio, 25 veterans;  
 Benton Harbor, Mich., 40 veterans;  
 Wapella, Ill., 12 veterans;  
 Ladonia, Wis., 12 veterans;  
 Stockton, Wis., 47 veterans;  
 McMinnville, Oreg., 60 veterans;  
 Ponce City, 50 veterans;  
 Clinton, Ohio, 40 veterans;  
 Wapakoneta, Ohio, 60 veterans;  
 Chase, Kans., 10 veterans;  
 Department of Nebraska, 200 veterans;  
 Denver, Colo., 50 veterans;  
 Address not given, 20 veterans;  
 Zionsville, Ohio, 15 veterans;  
 Clinton, Ind., 20 veterans;  
 Lebanon, Ky., 20 veterans;  
 La Salle, Ill., 19 veterans;  
 Sandoval, Ill., 20 veterans;  
 Lincoln, Nebr., 80 veterans;  
 Iowa, 118 veterans;  
 Wellston, Ohio, 58 veterans;  
 Highlands, N. C., 36 veterans;  
 Reeds, Mo., 20 veterans;  
 Banner County, Nebr., 40 veterans;  
 Gravette, Ark., 20 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 32 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 130 veterans;  
 Macon, Mo., 60 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 38 veterans;  
 Mount Carmel, Ill., 50 veterans;  
 Eldorado, Kans., 200 veterans;  
 Lumberport, W. Va., 50 veterans;  
 Quincy, Ill., 35 veterans;  
 Great Bend, Pa., 28 veterans;  
 Frisco, Okla., 30 veterans;  
 Joplin, Mo., 80 veterans;  
 Spokane, Mo., 50 veterans;  
 Jefferson County, N. Y., 20 veterans;  
 Gunnell, Iowa, 30 veterans;  
 Mardin, Okla., 18 veterans;  
 Quincy, Ill., 32 veterans;  
 Macomb, Okla., 40 veterans;  
 Mercersburg, Pa., 60 veterans;  
 Shawnee, Okla., 30 veterans;  
 Tixtelle, Pa., 24 veterans;  
 Eureka Springs, Ark., 100 veterans;  
 Moorefield, Ohio, 64 veterans;  
 Macon, Mo., 40 veterans;  
 Quincy, Ill., 30 veterans;  
 Marcellus, Mich., 88 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 30 veterans;  
 Zionsville, Ind., 40 veterans;  
 Martinsburg, Ohio;  
 Vermont, 10 veterans;  
 Rich Hill, Mo., 32 veterans;  
 Nodaway County, 52 veterans;  
 Keelon, Mich., 50 veterans;  
 Dowelton, Pa., 36 veterans;

Covington, Ohio, 32 veterans;  
 Leipsic, Ohio, 55 veterans;  
 Spencer, W. Va., two, 92 veterans and 37 veterans;  
 Thornburg, Ind., 90 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 50 veterans;  
 Parker, Kans., 40 veterans;  
 St. Joseph, Mich., 30 veterans;  
 West Chester, Pa., 28 veterans;  
 Kansas, 30 veterans;  
 Cuba, N. Y., 20 veterans;  
 Sedan, Kans., 30 veterans;  
 Tremont, Ohio, 64 veterans;  
 Burkett, Nebr., 300 veterans;  
 Washington, Kans., 90 veterans;  
 Clarinda, Iowa, 90 veterans;  
 Lockport, N. Y., 50 veterans;  
 Gasport, N. Y., 38 veterans;  
 Youngsville, Pa., 200 veterans;  
 Independence, Iowa, 200 veterans;  
 Cluster Post, Ind., 50 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 50 veterans;  
 Beaver County, Pa., 50 veterans;  
 Berg Hill, Ohio, 15 veterans;  
 Lawrence, Mo., 100 veterans;  
 Kellogg Post, of Antigo, Wis., 25 veterans;  
 Washburn, W. Va., 8 veterans;  
 Newark, Mo.;  
 Rosemund, Ill., 35 veterans;  
 Petworth, Ky., 35 veterans;  
 Johnson County, Mo., 30 veterans;  
 Sulphur Springs, Ark., 20 veterans;  
 Harrisonburg, Linn County, Oreg., 22 veterans;  
 Portland, Oreg., 94 veterans;  
 Atkins, Ark., 20 veterans;  
 Lebanon, Kans., 27 veterans;  
 Grand Army of the Republic post of Tulsa, Okla., 20 veterans;  
 Aurora, Mo., 24 veterans;  
 Webster City, Iowa, 27 veterans;  
 Rings Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of West Unity, Ohio, 67 veterans;  
 Arcanum, Ohio, 19 veterans;  
 Long Island, Kans., 70 veterans;  
 Clinton, Ind., 40 veterans;  
 Traer, Kans., 20 veterans;  
 What Cheer, Iowa, 20 veterans;  
 Baker Post, of Pineville, Mo., 20 veterans;  
 Mount Valley, Kans., 24 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, two, 25 veterans and 47 veterans;  
 Denver, Colo., 40 veterans;  
 Oswego, Kans., 52 veterans;  
 Corvallis, Oreg., 9 veterans;  
 Marshall County and Saline County, 120 veterans;  
 Quincy, Ill., 80 veterans;  
 Napa County, Cal., two, 125 veterans and 200 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, two, 303 veterans and 87 veterans;  
 Queensboro, Ky., 20 veterans;  
 Cynget, Ohio, 100 veterans;  
 Martinsburg, W. Va., 40 veterans;  
 A. S. Williams Post, of Charleston, Mich.;  
 Mooers Forks, N. Y., 20 veterans;  
 Dodge Post, of Nashua, Iowa, 28 veterans;  
 Newberry, Pa.;  
 Williamsport, Pa., 50 veterans;  
 Salt Lake City, Utah;  
 Mount Vernon, Ill., 20 veterans;  
 Kelso, Scott County, Mo., 9 veterans;  
 White Hall, Ill., 53 veterans;  
 Ohio, 71 veterans;  
 Columbia City, Ind., 66 veterans;  
 New Salem, Ill., 44 veterans;  
 A. H. Cockrum Post, 192 veterans;  
 Chapman, Kans., 20 veterans;  
 Weatherwa Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Michigan, 40 veterans;  
 Coapling Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Illinois, 30 veterans;  
 La Veta, Colo., 50 veterans;  
 New York, 170 veterans;  
 Middle Point, Ohio, 50 veterans;  
 Lewis, Edwards County, Kans., 40 veterans;  
 Griggs Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Newton, N. J., 23 veterans;  
 Cumberland, N. J., 10 veterans;

James Mason Post;  
 Reese Mitchell Post, of Ohio, 135 veterans;  
 Sunbury, Ohio, 50 veterans;  
 Indiana, 34 veterans;  
 Fulda, Minn., 15 veterans;  
 Bethlehem, Ind., 34 veterans;  
 Columbus, Miss., 54 veterans;  
 Monroe, Ill., 50 veterans;  
 Great Bend, Pa., 15 veterans;  
 Cadillac, Mich., 25 veterans;  
 Macon, Ill., 40 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 3 veterans, 15 veterans, 60 veterans, and 75 veterans;  
 Corbin, Ky., 18 veterans;  
 Marshall County, Ind., 1,000 veterans;  
 Johnson City, Ill., 45 veterans;  
 Tate Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Victoria, Ill., 15 veterans;  
 George Washington Post, of Colorado, 98 veterans;  
 Cleveland County, Okla., 50 veterans;  
 Bond Post, Grand Rapids, Ohio;  
 Warren County, Ohio;  
 Clermont County, Ohio;  
 Hamilton County, Ohio, 24 veterans;  
 William Landon Post, of Knox, Ind.;  
 Harvey Post, of Harvey, Ill.;  
 Abilene Post, Department of Kansas;  
 Reynolds Post, of Blaine, Wash.;  
 Reno Post, of Roseburg, Oreg., 125 veterans;  
 Price Post, of Centralia, Wash., 50 veterans;  
 Butterworth Post, of Coldwater, Mich.;  
 Dayton, Ohio, 6,000 veterans;  
 Leavenworth, Kans., two, 400 veterans and 600 veterans;  
 Marion, Ind., 500 veterans;  
 Johnson City, Tenn., 500 veterans;  
 Hampton, Va., 300 veterans;  
 Bath, Me., 50 veterans;  
 Lumberport, W. Va., 33 veterans;  
 New York Grand Army of the Republic posts, 540 veterans;  
 Buckley Post, of Akron, Ohio, 300 veterans;  
 Marion, Ind., 350 veterans;  
 State of Colorado, 50 veterans;  
 Mount Zion, Ind., 20 veterans;  
 Charles K. Post, of Garrett, Ind., 22 veterans;  
 Gove City, Kans., 20 veterans;  
 Denver, Colo., 20 veterans;  
 Stockton, Mo., 164 veterans;  
 Stoutland, Mo., 30 veterans;  
 Zericho Springs, Mo., 26 veterans;  
 Longmont, Colo., 60 veterans;  
 Wellsville, Mo., 50 veterans;  
 West Middlesex, Pa., two, 80 veterans and 62 veterans;  
 Palisade, Nebr., 20 veterans;  
 Isminger Post, of Chariton, Iowa, 50 veterans;  
 Post No. 483, of McSearboro, Ill., 8 veterans;  
 Indiana, 28 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 25 veterans;  
 Angola, Ind., 75 veterans;  
 Carmen, Ill., four, 20 veterans, 32 veterans, 40 veterans, and 20 veterans;  
 Russel Post, of Hamilton, Ill., 100 veterans;  
 Stokenburg, Pa., 37 veterans;  
 Newark, Mo., 15 veterans;  
 Reidsville, Ohio, 20 veterans;  
 Mississippi County, Mo., 20 veterans;  
 Fort Scott, Kans., 40 veterans;  
 Illinois, 20 veterans;  
 Lewisburg, Ky., 26 veterans;  
 Danville, Ohio, 30 veterans;  
 Marshall, Mo., 20 veterans;  
 Yankton, S. Dak., 15 veterans;  
 Osceola, Miss., 24 veterans;  
 Wausau, Wis., 80 veterans;  
 Le Roy, Kans., 20 veterans;  
 Winchester, Va., 5 veterans;  
 Fort Haven, Mo., 40 veterans;  
 Springfield, Oreg., 9 veterans;  
 Fayetteville, Ark., 20 veterans;  
 Christian County, Mo., 15 veterans;  
 Arcadia, Nebr., 180 veterans;  
 Stoutland, Mo., 20 veterans;  
 Lakewood, N. J., 64 veterans;  
 Cincinnati, Ohio, 20 veterans;  
 Louisiana, Mo., 90 veterans;

Ashland, Iowa, 30 veterans;  
 Mulhall, Okla., 100 veterans;  
 Hamilton County, Kans., 20 veterans;  
 Texas, 47 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 250 veterans;  
 Michigan, 190 veterans;  
 Chicago, Ill., 160 veterans;  
 Tennessee, 560 veterans;  
 Chelsea, Mass., 100 veterans;  
 Maine, 50 veterans;  
 Post-office address not given, 98 veterans;  
 Sautelle, Cal., 90 veterans;  
 Grand Army of the Republic post of Clinton, Iowa;  
 Harvey Post, No. 724, Department of Illinois, of Harvey, Ill.;  
 George E. Stowe, commander, George Washington Post, Department of Colorado and Wyoming;  
 John C. Mosley, commander, Seward Nelson Post, No. 251, of Wapello, Ill.;  
 Grand Army of the Republic post of Clinton, Ind.;  
 Cedar Gap (Mo.) Post, by John Gilton;  
 West Middlesex (Pa.) Post, by E. D. Powell, adjutant;  
 McKinley Post, Knoxville, Tenn.;  
 Irwin McDowell Post, Enid, Okla.;  
 James Smith Post, Wellston, Ohio;  
 State Soldiers' Home, St. James, Mo.;  
 Veterans of Fort Scott, Kans.;  
 Grand Army of the Republic post of Humansville, Mo.;  
 Forsyth Post, Toledo, Ohio;  
 Volunteer Post, Toledo, Ohio;  
 Veterans of Wood County, Ohio;  
 J. B. McPherson Post, Miami, Okla.;  
 Pacific Branch Veterans, Los Angeles County, Cal.;  
 Ex-Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines' Protective Association, Toledo, Ohio;  
 Veterans, by Edger Hayes, Sixth Wisconsin Battery;  
 Post 20, Rising City, Nebr.;  
 Eugene Rawson Post, Fremont, Ohio, 31 veterans;  
 Greenville (Mich.) Post, Grand Army of the Republic, 33 veterans;  
 Mart Armstrong Post, Lima, Ohio, by G. E. Copeland, post commander; O. H. Hollister, acting adjutant;  
 Lozure Post, of Wauseon, Ohio, 125 veterans;  
 Eugene Rawson Post, Fremont, Ohio;  
 Grand Army of the Republic Post, 83 veterans, of Greenville, Mich.;  
 George W. Robinson Post, Amelia, Ohio;  
 J. C. McCoy Post, No. 1, Columbus, Ohio;  
 Veterans of the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors' Home;  
 Veterans of Battle Mountain Sanitarium, South Dakota;  
 De Golyer Post, No. 110, Grand Army of the Republic, Hudson, Ohio;  
 Veterans of the National Military Home, Kansas;  
 Veterans of Carver Post, No. 28, Hemlock, Mich.;  
 A. L. Carver Post, No. 28, Hemlock, Mich.;  
 William Perrott Post, No. 22, Buchanan, Mich., Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic;  
 Manhattan Post, No. 271, of Manhattan, Kans., by Col. C. M. Howe;  
 Lew Gove Post, 91 members;  
 Veterans of Grand Army of the Republic post, Troy, Ohio;  
 Veterans, by Harmon A. Jones, Eighth Iowa Cavalry;  
 Canfield Post, Canfield, Ohio;  
 Veterans of the Iowa Soldiers' Home, Marshalltown, Iowa;  
 J. B. Streetman Post, No. 19, Reed City, Mich.; and  
 Chanute Post, No. 129, Chanute, Kans.—  
 to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Connecticut Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring competitive examinations for appointments in the Census Office—to the Committee on the Census.  
 By Mr. SHEPPARD: Papers to accompany House joint resolution 160, empowering President to appoint a commission to test arsenization theory for prevention of yellow fever—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.  
 By Mr. SMITH of California: Petition of the Imperial Valley Chamber of Commerce, in support of H. R. 13997, asking that the Southern Pacific Railway Company be paid for work done during the break in Colorado River—to the Committee on Claims.  
 By Mr. WILLIAMS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Rosa Quine Raley, heir of Julia Quine—to the Committee on War Claims.